DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 334 UD 011 563

AUTHOR	Heller, Barbara R.; Barrett, Richard S.
TITLE	Expand and Improve ... A Critical Review of the First Three Years of ESEA Title I in New York City.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 70
NOTE	202p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Depressed Areas (Geographic), Early Childhood Education, Educational Development, Educational Finance, Educational Objectives, Educational Planning, Evaluation Criteria, *Evaluation Techniques, Exceptional Child Education, *Federal Programs, Guidance Programs, Language Programs, *Program Descriptions, *Summative Evaluation, Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, New York City

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report covers all ESEA Title I projects in the New York City Public Schools. Background material includes a descriptive overview of the school system; sources, purposes, and legal functions of funding; eligibility and selections of participants; overall objectives of the programs; and, planning and administration of programs. Each type of program (or component) is examined and evaluated--including classroom and special programs, teacher training, and community participation. Future goals and services of Title I are discussed. The role of evaluation and problems associated with evaluating Title I programs are presented, together with a new evaluation model. (Author/DM)

ED051334

203

Center for Urban Education
School Division
105 Madison Avenue
New York City, New York 10016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Expand and Improve . . .
A Critical Review of the First Three Years of ESEA Title I in New York City

Barbara R. Heller
Richard S. Barrett

with the assistance of
Marge Benjamin
Judith A. Eisler
Farrell L. McClane
George Weinberg

July 1970

Evaluation of New York City programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York.

UD011563

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Board of Trustees of the Center for Urban Education proposed that we examine the overall Title I program in New York City. Our investigation would not have been accomplished without the interest and cooperation of a great many other people as well. Joseph Krevisky and Jacob Landers provided inspiration, and we are grateful for their continued confidence. Dr. Robert A. Dentler, Director of the Center for Urban Education, actively supported and encouraged the undertaking. And very special appreciation is due to Dr. Rita Senf for her guidance, patience, and insight during the planning stages. Dr. Senf and Dr. Dentler also read the manuscript critically and helpfully prior to its publication.

We are indebted to Drs. Leo S. Goldstein, J. Wayne Wrightstone, and Eugene T. Maleska who, during their association with this project, worked toward its fruition. We also want to thank Dr. Samuel D. McClelland and Mr. Gene Satin for their cooperation and assistance.

It is not possible to list by name all the staff of the Center who participated in the production of this manuscript. We wish space permitted mention of the individual contributions of all the other professionals who gave of their time and knowledge. We are greatly indebted to the clerks, typists, administrative assistant, and other support personnel who with great patience typed, tabulated, checked, and duplicated this report...and then did it over again. We wish to take this public opportunity to thank them.

Under many of the chapter titles, names of one or two staff members are indicated. These people assumed major responsibility for those chapters. Acknowledging their authorship is not intended to diminish the recognition due to all staff members, but rather as a special tribute to their individual effort. When no authorship is listed, the senior authors assumed primary responsibility.

Each chapter was planned jointly, the content was discussed, and revisions were based on the suggestions of all. In this sense, every staff member actively contributed to each chapter of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
I	TITLE I: A DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW	5
	The New York City School System	5
	Where Title I Funds Come From	7
	To Whom the Money Goes	8
	What the Funds Can Supply	10
	What the Money is Used For	11
II	POPULATION: THE SCHOOLS AND THE CHILDREN	14
	Allocation of Funds to LEAs	14
	Poverty Area Boundaries	15
	School Eligibility	17
	Selection of Project Schools	19
	Identification of Needs for Project Planning	22
	The Participating Children	24
III	OBJECTIVES: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	30
	Designation of Program Priorities	32
	Project Design	33
	Objectives Related to Project Procedures	38
	Size, Scope, and Quality	40
	Categorization of Projects by Needs	41
IV	IMPLEMENTATION: PLANNING, ADMINISTRATION, AND FINANCES	43
	Local Administration	43
	Project Development	45
	State Program Review	46
	State Fiscal Responsibility	48
	Funding and Budgeting	49
	Project Implementation	52
	Communication as an Implementation Problem	56
V	EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS	59
	Preschool Component	59
	Early Grade Component	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
VI	REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	68
	Integration Component	68
	Compensatory Education Program Component	74
	Innovative and Experimental Program Component	76
VII	MOTIVATIONAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	81
	College Preparation Program Component	81
	School Retention Program Component	84
	Vocational Preparatory Program Component	86
VIII	SUPPLEMENTARY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	89
	Afterschool and Summer Program Component	89
	Corrective Program Component	92
	English-as-a-Second Language Program Component	94
IX	ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	97
X	SPEECH PROGRAMS	102
	Basic Speech Improvement Component	102
	Clinical Speech Therapy Component	104
XI	GUIDANCE PROGRAMS	106
	Guidance Centers Component	106
	Special Schooling Component	110
	Institutional Schools Component	112
XII	PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	114
XIII	TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS	117
	Programs to Provide Additional Personnel	119
	General Teacher Training Institutes	120
	Curriculum Development and Teacher Training	121
	General Concerns	122
XIV	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I	127
	Parent Activities	129
	Paraprofessionals	131
	Community Participation on School Advisory Boards	134
	The Role of the Community Action Agency	135

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
XV	TITLE I IN THE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS	142
	Eligibility of Nonpublic School Children	143
	Title I Funds for Nonpublic Schools.	145
	Sites for Services	147
	Kinds of Services.	148
	The Future	152
XVI	EVALUATION	154
	Evaluation in New York City.	155
	The Role of Evaluation	157
	A New Evaluation Model	160
	Evaluation Budgets and Contracting	163
	Technical Considerations	165
XVII	RECOMMENDATIONS.	168
	INDEX.	183
	REFERENCES	187

INTRODUCTION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 represented a major breakthrough in education in the United States. It established specific priorities and directed new federal funds to local educational agencies for the purpose of improving the educational milieu of the children of the poor. Title I of the ESEA, "Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for the Education of Children from Low-Income Families," sought to remedy the inequality in educational achievement displayed by children living in conditions of poverty. In the language of the original Act, Title I provided "financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."[1]

Largely because the Congress sought to overcome the specter of federal domination of education, it permitted the local educational agencies to initiate and implement programs of their choice. With the wide latitude allowed under the provisions of Title I, the New York City Board of Education implemented more than 100 projects between 1965 and 1968. These projects were designed to reach approximately 250,000 low-income children at all grade levels from prekindergarten through high school; to cover diversified activities including remedial instruction, cultural enrichment, and guidance; to improve instruction by reducing class size, developing new curricula, and retraining teachers; and to correct racial imbalance and foster integration.

The ESEA required annual evaluations of the Title I projects. The Board of Education elected to conduct some of the evaluations of individual projects by its own Bureau of Educational Research and to contract the others to outside agencies. In the first year, the Center for Urban Education, a regional laboratory supported under Title IV of the ESEA, was the sole outside contractor. In subsequent years, increasing numbers of evaluations were contracted to other agencies. Thus Title I has had the scrutiny of many different independent evaluators. The use of outside evaluators does not guarantee objectivity, but it does mean that the investigators were relatively free to study what they thought was important, and to report their results as they saw fit. The evaluation reports reflect their points of view, biases, strengths and weaknesses, and varying methodologies and philosophies.

Over the years questions have been posed by legislators, educators, and community leaders about projected and actual expenditures of funds,

---

[1]PL 89-10, Sec. 201.

target populations, concentration of effort, extent of innovation, and the effectiveness of projects initiated under Title I of the ESEA of 1965. As early as the second year of its operation, many groups, diversified in their points of view, expressed a need for an overview of New York City's Title I program -- for a study that was more than an annual summary of the year's reports. These various interest groups -- the Board of Education, the nonpublic school representatives, the Council Against Poverty, the Center for Urban Education, and concerned citizen groups -- converged on the need for a study that would assemble and evaluate the numerous and seemingly diverse projects.

The Board of Education took a commendable step in commissioning an extensive overall investigation in the second year of Title I operations, subjecting its programs and activities to even more searching scrutiny than is possible within the individual studies. Such a study would have benefited if it had been planned for from the outset. Regrettably, no provision was made in advance to collect and systematize the necessary data on which to base generalized indices of program success and failure. A study based on the individual evaluations taken as a whole is fragmentary, since the separate reports do not easily lend themselves to comparisons. Notwithstanding these limitations, the separate evaluations have certain advantages: they are based on observations of projects in progress, and assess the attainment of the specific project objectives. Viewed as a whole, these reports are the best available source of raw material -- both in their strengths and weaknesses -- for studying the overall direction that Title I is taking in New York City.

As one of the major agencies evaluating individual Title I projects, the Center for Urban Education contracted with the New York City Board of Education to conduct the overall study, which was deliberately structured to consider issues cutting across program lines, and the development of a program over a three-year period.

The first part of the overall study appeared in June 1968. A History and Description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-1968, by Barbara R. Heller, was concerned with a description of the implementation of Title I in the City school system, a survey of the funded projects and activities, a description of the concentration of projects by schools, and an examination of the funds budgeted and expended.

This part of the report is designed to provide information for many interested groups, in addition to the officials of the Board of Education who were the primary recipients of evaluation reports. The information that follows should be of value also to legislators and their staffs who are concerned with modifying Title I activities; to professionals of the Office of Education, state education departments, and local educational agencies who implement the programs; to professional organizations representing teachers and other members of the staffs of the schools who are responsible for teaching the youngsters; to representatives of par-

ent and community groups who wish to influence the course of education of the diadvantaged; and to any other concerned citizen. The report does not treat any single project in detail -- the interested reader is invited to peruse copies of project descriptions and evaluation reports on file with the Center for Urban Education.

This report goes beyond the project descriptions and evaluations. Officials of the Board of Education and representatives of outside organizations were interviewed. In addition, staff members who had worked closely on various aspects of Title I, such as the involvement of community action agencies contributed from their own experience. The Board generously provided fiscal information regarding budgets and expenditures and helpful suggestions. They permitted the Center access to all the information we needed and complete freedom in summarizing the information and drawing conclusions.

There are two major goals of the report. The first is to summarize the Title I efforts in New York City in terms of what was planned, what happened, and how well it worked. As the reader will observe, the data necessary for this summary is to varying degrees inadequate and the report will in part document the fact that information on the projects that may be legitimately sought by the reader is not available.

The second purpose is to make recommendations to improve Title I. These recommendations touch on minor considerations -- such as making sure that adequate space is available -- to major points -- such as devising a new educational program for prekindergarten children. Weight was given to the stated and implied recommendations of the individual evaluators and in addition the recommendations reflect our retrospective overall views.

For the purpose of this report, the projects were grouped into program area categories reflecting the major focus of intended activity; each area is treated in a separate chapter. Within each of the program areas, projects may be further subgrouped into components of a similar nature. Each component is described briefly; the material from individual project proposals and evaluation reports is summarized, synthesized, and presented in a uniform manner purposefully designed to highlight essential substantive problems. We arrived at our classification only after much discussion. We feel that the process of classifying and categorizing lends an important dimension -- organization -- to the conceptualizing of Title I activities during the period 1965 to 1968. Any system of classification is arbitrary. It imposes an ex post facto order on activities that were more randomly conceived. Our system of categorizing, in which each project is included in only one program area, despite the diversity of the techniques and methodologies employed in its execution, involves some distortion in an attempt to provide a cohesive account of a series of disparate events.

There are important issues that cut across program lines, and some of these are also included. A separate chapter is devoted to an examination of the intended and actual target populations, the development and program objectives, and to the implementation process. In addition, this report considers the participation of nonpublic school children, decentralization and involvement of parents and community in educational activities, and evaluation and its impact on program development. A final section summarizes recommendations.

A report about Title I in New York City is a report about the education of the disadvantaged school child. We will illustrate that Title I has had some successes and some failures, just as is true of the school system as a whole. We hope that an examination and an understanding of the Title I past will lead to a firmer foundation for the planning and execution of future educational activities to improve the possibilities for the young people in the City.

CHAPTER I

TITLE I: A DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW

The 89th Congress of the United States approved Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, by a roll-call vote of 73 to 18 in the Senate and 263 to 153 in the House of Representatives. On April 11, 1965, the Act was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, culminating years of extensive testimony and deliberation in attempts to pass federal educational legislation. As originally passed and interpreted subsequently, the predominant thrust of the ESEA is contained in Title I, which receives more funds and attention than all the other titles combined.

The ESEA of 1965 originally had six titles. Title I was concerned with the relationship between the cycle of poverty and low educational achievement, and placed the major emphasis of the Act on meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. Title II provided "School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials" for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Title III, "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," stimulated and assisted the development of exemplary programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Title IV, "Educational Research and Training," updated the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 and provided grants to universities, colleges, and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations for research and dissemination. Title V provided grants to strengthen state departments of education. Amendments changed the original Title VI to provide assistance for the education of handicapped children, and added a new Title VII and VIII, "Bilingual Education" and "Dropout Prevention" Programs, respectively.

Before continuing with a description of how Title I operates in New York City, a brief overview of the New York City public school system will be presented for the general reader who is not conversant with its size and administrative structure. For the purposes of Title I funding, and for this report, New York City is considered a single local educational agency (LEA) under the administrative control of the Board of Education. Title I in New York City operates within this framework.

THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

During the three years that this study covers, general control of the public schools in New York City was vested in the Board of Education, which consisted of nine members appointed by the Mayor. These members served without salary and were responsible for setting policy for the operation of the schools and for approving expenditures of funds. Starting with the 1968-1969 year, as a result of state legislation, the schools

are operating under an interim decentralization plan in which certain Board functions are delegated to the local school boards.

The chief executive officer of the City school system is the Superintendent of Schools whose primary responsibility is to implement the Board's policy. He is aided by an Executive Deputy Superintendent, four Deputy Superintendents, and 30 District Assistant Superintendents. In addition, there are staff assistant superintendents and directors of special subjects, areas, and services who have various administrative, supervisory, and advisory responsibilities.

The City public school system is divided into 30 local districts, each of which has an average of 30 schools and 35,000 pupils. Each district is administered by an assistant superintendent, and has a local school board composed of members who reside within the district. Under decentralization, more responsibility will be given to the district superintendents and the local school boards.

New York City's public schools are organized as elementary, junior high or intermediate, and academic and vocational high schools. There are special schools for socially maladjusted pupils, children with retarded mental development, children in hospitals and shelters, and children who are visually, acoustically, or physically handicapped. Table I-1 summarizes the number of public schools in New York City in 1967-68. In addition to the 1,110,000 children attending almost 900 public schools, there are approximately 435,000 more children attending more than 600 private schools, both secular and denominational. Of the system's 755 public elementary and junior high-intermediate schools, 347 are designated Special Service schools on the basis of pupils' limitations and other criteria; reading extra personnel and larger allotments for books and supplies are allocated to these schools.

TABLE I-1

TOTAL NUMBER OF NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CHILDREN, AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF REGISTER, 1967-68[a]

	Number of Schools[b]	Total Register (in thousands)	Ethnic Composition (in percents)			Total Pupil Turnover (in thousands)
			Puerto Rican	Negro	Other	
Elementary	609	608	24	33	43	244
Junior High	146	222	24	30	46	61
Academic High Schools	61	230	13	23	64	43
Vocational High Schools	29	42	30	30	40	
Special Schools	49	7	33	40	27	n.a.
Total Public Schools	894	1,100	22	30	48	348

[a]Adapted from Facts and Figures 1967/1968, compiled by the New York City Board of Education.

[b]Includes only permanent school buildings.

The Board of Education's total expense budget for the operation of the public schools is one billion dollars; approximately 60 percent of this amount is raised through annual tax levies on real property. Approximately 34 percent is the portion allocated to the City under State Aid. The remainder comes from federal and state sources under specific programs. This budget is used to pay the salaries of all employees, repairs, and educational supplies and equipment.

The City authorizes educational positions for more than 67,000 professionals, including teachers, principals, department chairmen, etc., of which about 56,000 are day-school teachers. There are almost 21,000 additional noneducational positions authorized. In 1967-68 10,000 paraprofessionals were employed by the Board of Education and paid from City and federal funds.

WHERE TITLE I FUNDS COME FROM

Under the ESEA, Title I payments are made to state education departments which in turn allocate the funds to the local school districts on the basis of a formula. The specific project plans are subject to state review and approval under regulations and guidelines established federally.

Qualifying local educational agencies (LEAs) are entitled to funds on the basis of the number of needy children, irrespective of whether the children attend public or private schools. The formula for the basic grant, or entitlement, as determined by law, is the number of needy children multiplied by one-half the annual state expenditure for education per child. The formula determining the distribution of funds allows little discretion to the state departments.

Since the Congress does not authorize enough money to cover the total entitlements of all LEAs, the allocations to the LEAs are prorated so as not to exceed the available money. Thus, LEAs' actual grants have been less than what they are entitled to by law. For the first year, the authorization for Title I nationally was $1.1 billion; in the next year, $1.4 billion was authorized for Title I activities nationally; and in the third year which corresponds to the 1967-68 school year, $2.3 billion was authorized.

In 1965-66, New York City was entitled to (on the basis of the formula) $70.0 million, although it received $65.1 million as the prorated allocation. For the following year, New York City actually received $69.8 million, somewhat less than the $100.2 million to which it was entitled by formula. In 1967-68, New York City received $71.5 million in Title I funds.

For the first year of Title I, the formula included two groups of needy children: those from low-income families, and those whose families

are receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. According to the terms of the original Act, a low-income family is defined as having an income of $2,000 or less per year. This income level, which was not consistent with other federal legislation, was subsequently amended to a $3,000 level per year. This amendment was to go into effect when Congress appropriated enough money to meet all maximum entitlements based on the $2,000 income level.

By amendment to the 1965 Act, children in foster homes and institutions were added to the definition of needy children. Subsequent amendments further expanded the formula to include handicapped, neglected, and delinquent children, as well as other groups of children not found in New York City. More recently, a separate title was added to assist in the education of the handicapped.

In 1965-66, there were approximately 1,480,000 children attending public and private schools in New York City; of these, 178,126 or 12 percent met the definitions of needy. For 1966-67, of the approximate 1,500,000 school children in the City, 17 percent or 254,793 children were counted as needy for the purpose of the Title I formula. In 1967-68, 19 percent, or 289,464 children out of approximately 1,545,000 were included in the formula. The number of these needy children has increased over the years, not only because New York City has more poor children, but because of the more encompassing provisions and amendments to the law.

For the first three years of Title I, the maximum entitlement for New York City was calculated using one-half the state average annual per-pupil expenditure for education ($393). In 1967-68, LEAs had the option of using one-half the national average per-pupil expenditure if it was greater than the state's, but this option did not benefit New York City.

New York City receives a large amount of money under Title I, more than all but three states. These millions of dollars, however, actually represent a relatively small proportion of the total cost of education. In 1965-66, the Title I funds were 7.4 percent of the total expense budget under the administration of the Board of Education; in the following two years, Title I funds represented a decreasing proportion of the total budget, 6.8 percent and 6.4 percent, respectively. Moreover, since the total number of eligible children has increased, the Title I funds are spread further with the result that there is less money per eligible child; for each eligible child, New York City has had $366, $274, and $247 for each of the three years respectively.

TO WHOM THE MONEY GOES

Although the amount of Title I funds is based on the total number of needy children in the LEA, the money is to be spent in those schools in which these children are found in large numbers. Schools must prove their eligibility for Title I funds, using criteria established by the LEA.

According to the U.S. Office of Education Guidelines,[2] the LEA is responsible for reaching children in areas with high concentrations of low-income families. These areas, called "poverty areas" in New York City, should have a concentration of low-income families as high or higher than the citywide average. Since the 1966-67 school year the major responsibility for designating poverty areas has resided with the Council Against Poverty (CAP), New York City's recognized community action agency. Schools with the greatest concentrations of children from low-income families are the primary focus of the legislation.

Over the years definitions of eligibility requirements for schools in New York City have become more strict. The introduction of more specific requirements resulted in a decreasing number of eligible public and nonpublic schools. The big decrease occurred between the 1966-67 and the 1967-68 school years; by 1967-68, approximately half of the public schools in New York City were able to qualify for eligibility. The Board is quick to point out that mere eligibility of a school for Title I services does not necessarily mean that the school will receive such services. Other factors, to be discussed in the chapter on Population, determine which schools and which children in the school are to participate in a particular project. To avoid a means test for individual children, it was generally assumed that all children attending an eligible school met the criterion of economic need.

The federal Guidelines, in interpreting Section 205 (a) of the ESEA of 1965, argues for the "child benefit" interpretation of the Act. That is, arrangements or services should be designed to benefit the child rather than the school he attends. Services to needy children attending nonpublic schools are based, in part, on this concept. The child benefit philosophy is also at the core of the Open Enrollment program. In this project, services follow the child who elects to attend school outside the poverty area under an officially sponsored program of integration. Thus, services to Open Enrollment receiving schools not otherwise eligible for Title I funds are justified.

---

[2]U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Guidelines: Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children, ESEA of 1965/Title I, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, OE-35079. These federal Guidelines, Regulations, and Instructions supplement the ESEA and have the force of law. Hereafter, in this report, these Guidelines will be referred to as the federal Guidelines.

WHAT THE FUNDS CAN SUPPLY

Title I funds can be used to supply many different kinds of services, but may not be used to violate local contractual obligations. Further, Title I was intended to supplement local and state efforts, and the expenditure of Title I funds should be over and above existing expenditures for the education of the target children. The Office of Education requires LEAs to maintain the same per-pupil fiscal effort that they are making prior to the availability of ESEA funds.

In any Title I project, all or some teachers' salaries may derive from Title I. Teachers may be paid for participating in activities in addition to their regular duties, as for example, when they are involved in afterschool or summer programs. Title I funds may also pay for teacher training stipends and workshop fees.

Besides salaries for teaching personnel, there are other salaries which may be charged to Title I. These include both professional and nonprofessional staff -- attendance teachers and attendance workers; guidance counselors and family assistants; social workers; auxiliary classroom personnel, such as educational aides and educational assistants; salaries for medical, psychological, and health services; and, in certain instances, salaries for school custodial service. Approximately 85 percent of Title I money is budgeted for salaries. The New York City Board of Education budgets approximately the same percentage for similar personal services.

Title I funds are also used for other costs: textbooks, library books, and periodicals; audiovisual materials; and teaching supplies. These items together accounted for the second largest amount of funds budgeted in 1965-66 to 1967-68, although from the first to the third year the percent budgeted decreased by almost half.

Costs for pupil transportation, either as regularly scheduled field trips to places of civic and cultural interest, or as fares for visits to dental, medical, and other clinics, may also be charged to Title I. The amount of funds budgeted for these types of activities is very small, and in 1966-67, the peak year for this type of activity, did not exceed 1.2 percent of the total budget.

Title I also covers expenditures for the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, for food services, for student body activities, for community services, for minor remodeling, and for equipment. New York City budgets very little for food services or student body activities. Some money has been budgeted for minor remodeling, for example, the remodeling of classrooms for use as prekindergarten rooms. In the 1965-66 school year, the Board of Education budgeted approximately 5 percent of its total Title I funds for remodeling. This decreased substantially the following year, and has remained at approximately 0.1 percent of the total Title I budget.

The law is somewhat different for nonpublic schools. It prohibits the paying of salaries of teachers or other employees of nonpublic schools. In addition, title to, and control over the equipment used in projects in nonpublic schools must be maintained by the public Board of Education. No funds can be used for construction in the nonpublic schools.

Specific projects combine services differently. Although, in general, most projects budget the largest proportion of funds for salaries, there are instances where most of the funds are allotted to materials, or to pupil transportation, or to purchases of equipment. The distribution of funds among the different project activities often suggests the primary intent or goal of the project.

WHAT THE MONEY IS USED FOR

Title I relies on local initiative to design projects to meet the needs of the target population. The ESEA allows the LEAs great flexibility in program content and in methodological approaches to improving education for disadvantaged youth. Nevertheless, there are restrictions on the types of programs and services that may be funded. Some of the restrictions are inherent in the legislation. Others reflect local conditions. Still others result from the annual cycling of funding and evaluation.

Two legislative limitations concern maintenance of effort and concentration of effort; the former is primarily a fiscal consideration while the latter may be characterized as more educational in nature. Many groups have recently become concerned with LEAs' failures to use Title I funds to supplement ongoing fiscal efforts in educating the deprived school population, and are investigating possible abuses. Comparatively less investigation has been made of concentration of effort -- the legislative requirement that projects be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of success. Both requirements will be discussed in greater detail in this report.

Local conditions may also restrict program development. For example, the availability of specialist personnel or classroom space often determines the feasibility of undertaking a particular project. Furthermore, Title I funds must be used in conformity with local contractual and other legal obligations. Therefore, the New York City Board of Education must plan projects that conform not only to the requirements of the ESEA, but also to New York State law, to the Board's own priorities, and to the contract with the United Federation of Teachers.

The annual appropriation of funds is at variance with the optimal time and manner for planning educational activities; budget plans for the September school year must be completed in the prior spring. The federal

fiscal year begins in July, although the Congressional appropriation of funds for the year may not be made until much later, well after the start of school. In launching a new project, the timing becomes especially important since time is needed to assemble and assign staff, order materials and equipment, and inform the participants about the program.

Title I funds have been used in New York City to finance activities at every grade level from prekindergarten to high school; for activities with various objectives including changes in achievement, behavior, and attitudes; for children in public schools and in private schools; for innovative activities and for expansion of ongoing activities; for projects that are initiated by the central Board of Education and for others initiated by local communities. Title I has financed projects in a single school and projects that operate in hundreds of schools. There are projects that take place during the regular school day as well as afterschool and summer projects. Some of the projects are discrete and identifiable; others are interlocked with the regular school programs and are barely visible.

For this report the individual Title I projects have been grouped into the following program areas: Early Childhood, Regular Academic, Motivational Academic, Supplementary Academic, Enrichment, Speech, Guidance, Programs for Children with Special Needs, and Teacher Training. During the 1965 to 1968 years there were dramatic changes in the distribution of funds among these different areas. The most important shift occurred for the 1967-68 school year, and reflected the Board's introduction of Title I priorities. Programs that were implemented during the first and second years of the ESEA were largely expansions of projects either already in limited operation or previously conceived. With the adoption of formal priorities, many of these early projects were transferred back to the tax levy budget; new projects were initiated, others were discontinued, and some projects were consolidated as the Board attempted to make its Title I program more visible and more specifically related to meeting the needs of the deprived school children.

Because one of the major political considerations in the developmental history of the ESEA revolved around possible federal control of education, the final structure of the legislation established a new division of governmental responsibility. All levels of government play a role in implementing Title I. Since funds are distributed to the LEAs according to legislative formula, there is no competition for funds, and neither the state agency nor the federal government exercises much fiscal control. The state agency, however, has specific responsibilities for the supervision, review, and approval of LEA plans. The federal agency has more general responsibility for the conduct of the program at the national level.

Educationally, Title I directed attention to the needs of deprived students as the basis of program planning, and to the importance and

necessity of evaluation as insurance that funds were being put into activities likely to improve their education. Since passage of the Act five years ago, there have been changes in emphasis. Today the local educational community is concerned with community participation and involvement in educational activities, the need to develop a new framework for conducting evaluations of social-action programs, the structure of the educational establishment, and with teacher training and retraining in the light of new conditions and priorities. The ESEA of 1965 provided the impetus for the re-examination of our concepts about all children, and represents a national commitment to educationally disadvantaged children.

CHAPTER II

POPULATION: THE SCHOOLS AND THE CHILDREN

The ESEA of 1965 was passed to ensure that "poverty will no longer be a bar to learning and [that] learning shall offer an escape from poverty."[1] This piece of legislation has received recognition as a program of social action in education, primarily aimed at changing the social and political order, and only secondarily addressed to traditional educational considerations. The wording of the Act, together with the rhetoric surrounding its enactment, reflected the belief of the legislators that there is a strong correlation between poverty and educational deprivation. The real aim of the ESEA was to reduce poverty by increasing the quality of education for the poor.

Under Title I the LEA's primary responsibility is to design activities (i.e., projects) that meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Because of the way funds are allocated to LEAs and the procedures for initiating projects under Title I, the target child is defined first in financial (poverty) terms, and only then, if at all, on the basis of educational deprivation. Moreover, as we will indicate, although the law focuses on eligible children, as it has been implemented locally pupil participation has been largely determined by enrollment in an eligible school.

In this chapter we will examine the way the target child is defined, and the process by which school eligibility is determined in New York City, as well as the selection of participants, and the problems of identifying those actually receiving services as compared with those for whom the services are intended.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO LEAs

The basic grant to the LEA is determined by the total number of eligible children within its jurisdiction. By law, eligibility was defined in terms of economic deprivation -- eligible children were between the ages of 5 and 17 from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000, and from families receiving payments under the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. New categories of handicapped,

---

[1]From Mr. Wayne Morse, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (89th Congress), Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Report together with Minority and Individual Views, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, No. 146, p.4.

neglected, and delinquent children were added by amendment. For funding purposes, the total count of eligible children includes all such needy children attending public and nonpublic schools, as well as preschool children. For the 1965-66 school year, New York City received its funds on the basis of 178,126 such children. For 1966-67, New York City received funds for 254,793 eligible children; and for the school year 1967-68, 289,464 children were counted.

In New York City alternate poverty criteria were developed to avoid a means test for individual children. These criteria, which were to be consistent with the intent of the legislation, included residency in a poverty area and eligibility for free school lunch. Each year, individual schools submit data specifying their enrollment of children who meet the poverty criteria. These data are the basis for the LEA's annual application for Title I funds, and also serve as the basis for assigning Title I services to schools with concentrated numbers of low-income pupils.

POVERTY AREA BOUNDARIES

According to the federal Guidelines the objective for the LEA is to reach children in areas with high concentrations of low-income families, concentrations at least equal to the citywide average. Theoretically, all areas should be ranked on the basis of concentration of low-income families, and the more concentrated areas served first.

In New York City these areas of high concentrations of low-income families have been called poverty areas, and by agreement with the Board of Education, the Council Against Poverty (CAP) has designated them.[2] A poverty area is a combination of health districts; the City's vital statistics are collected by health districts and information about average income is available for them. Poverty area boundaries are not necessarily congruent with school zones nor with school district boundaries. Each poverty area has a community corporation acting as the local community action agency. The current configuration of poverty area boundaries is a potential source of difficulty which might become exaggerated when larger amounts of Title I funds are decentralized. Some evidence from the studies of the District Decentralized Title I projects suggests that those districts experiencing the most problems in planning and implementing Title I decentralized projects are subject

[2]For a more complete description of the role of the Council Against Poverty see chapter on Community Participation in Title I.

to pressures from several different community corporations.

Over the years the number of poverty areas has increased; in 1965-66 there were 16 areas, and by 1967-68 there were 26 designated poverty areas. The boundary lines have also changed reflecting in part the high mobility of the City's population and the attempt by the Board of Education to exclude pockets of affluence located within poverty boundaries and to include pockets of poverty located outside the designated areas. If changes in boundaries are made after the start of a school year it is possible, although not likely, for Title I services to be discontinued to a school that is no longer eligible. To avoid the possibility of disrupting a school during the year, and to aid in project planning, the CAP agreed to meet an early deadline for establishing poverty area boundaries.

Redrawing poverty area boundaries each year can mean discontinuing a project in some schools while starting the same project in newly eligible schools. For those projects in operation more than one year there have been great changes in the participating schools.[3] For example, in each of the three recyclings of the Prekindergarten project, each year between 130 and 150 schools were selected to participate; only 84 of the same schools were continuously listed. The Open Enrollment project showed a similar pattern of participation, as did the projects for children in the nonpublic schools.

Because of questions about the school selection process, which will be discussed below, it is difficult to assess what proportion of the schools added to or deleted from a recycled project result from changes in poverty area boundaries. Since many of the schools in which one project has been discontinued have received services under another Title I project, it is not invariably a question of a school no longer being eligible. There may be enough instances of school ineligibility resulting from changes in poverty area boundaries, however, for the Board of Education to consider maintaining some service to these schools. Support for this may have to come from other funding sources but the benefits to children from this kind of follow-through may justify the expenditure.

Once the areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families are identified, schools and children in or from those areas are eligible for Title I services. Through 1966-67 it was the practice of the Board to assume that a school physically located in a poverty area was composed of a majority of children residing in the area. It was, therefore, very important to establish meaningful boundary lines.

---

[3] Barbara R. Heller, A History and Description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-68. Center for Urban Education, June 1968.

SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY

In 1965-66, Title I services went primarily to Special Service schools and to schools receiving Open Enrollment children. In 1966-67, when CAP first designated the poverty areas, there was an effort to assign Title I services to schools in those areas. But it was not until the third year that an effective attempt was made to limit services to schools enrolling large numbers of eligible poor children. For 1967-68 the Board of Education adopted the first formal set of criteria for determining eligibility of individual schools. The determination of school eligibility is crucial because it is still assumed that all children attending these schools are from low-income families, and hence are the proper target of the legislation.

The criteria for 1967-68 follow:[4]

A. Pupils attending schools, both public and nonpublic, located in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if 50% or more of the pupils in these schools reside within the designated poverty areas.

B. Pupils attending schools, both public and nonpublic, located outside poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if 50% or more of the pupils in these schools reside within poverty areas, and if the distance from the poverty area does not exceed the following:

   1. High Schools - One mile.

   2. Other Schools - Three short blocks, or one long block (approximately 750 feet).

C. Pupils who live in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty but who elect to attend schools outside the poverty areas under an officially sponsored program of integration will be eligible for ESEA Title I services.

---

[4] Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs, New York City Board of Education: Summary of Proposed Programs, 1967-68, Title I -- ESEA. August 30, 1967. The Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs, is the Board's administrative unit responsible for funded programs. See chapter on Implementation.

D. 1. Pupils in school attendance areas outside the designated poverty areas will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if:

(a) The median retardation in reading is:

(1) One year or more in grade 5 of elementary school.

(2) Two years or more in grade 8 of intermediate or junior high school.

(3) Two years or more in the entering class of high school;

AND

(b) 30% or more of the pupils in the school are eligible for free lunch.

2. Pupils attending nonpublic schools located in the school attendance areas of public schools designated in accordance with D1, above, will be eligible under the same conditions as those indicated in D1 (a) and D1 (b).

These criteria established guidelines not only for public and nonpublic schools within poverty areas, but also for those schools located outside poverty area boundaries. However, the criteria were still considered too inclusive, since all schools within poverty areas that enrolled 50 percent or more of their children from among residents of poverty areas were eligible for Title I. The following year, 1968, to further limit the number of schools, the Board of Education proposed new criteria. The principal modification required all schools to meet both the residency and the free lunch requirements.

In recognition of the numerous difficulties involved in the collection of free lunch data from the nonpublic schools (see chapter on Nonpublic School Participation), the Board of Education adopted educational equivalents of free lunch for both public and nonpublic schools for 1968-69. Specifically, for any particular school, either 30 percent or more of the pupils must be eligible for free lunch or -- "the extent of academic retardation [in the school] is similar to that which exists in schools in which 30 percent or more of the pupils are eligible for free lunch."[5]

---

[5] Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs, New York City Board of Education. Summary of Proposed Programs, 1968-69, Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, August 26, 1968. Starting with the 1967-68 school year OSFAP has prepared an annual Summary of Proposed Programs.

The result of more stringent criteria was an overall reduction in the number of public schools selected to participate in Title I projects. In 1965-66, 696 public schools were selected to participate in Title I projects.[6] In 1966-67, a total of 708 public schools, or 81 percent of all City schools, were listed as participants. For 1967-68 there was a great decrease in the number of schools selected to participate; 556, approximately 65 percent of the total number of public schools, were listed. Fewer schools were listed in subsequent years. The reduction occurred mainly for schools outside designated poverty areas. In 1966-67, more than three-fourths of the schools outside of poverty areas were selected to participate, but by 1967-68, less than 40 percent of schools outside these areas were selected.

The eligibility requirements do not appear to have affected the total number of qualifying nonpublic schools. Our tabulations indicate that in 1965-66, 184 nonpublic schools were selected to participate; for 1966-67 there were 217 schools. In 1967-68 we tabulated 194 nonpublic schools; the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs, OSFAP, reports 187 for that year, almost all of which were in poverty areas.

The Board has stated that not all eligible schools are necessarily entitled to Title I services; factors such as available funds and the educational deprivation of the pupils are also considered. However, it is probable that any public school qualifying on the basis of residency and free lunch or educational equivalents will in fact be selected to participate in at least one Title I project.

SELECTION OF PROJECT SCHOOLS

In assigning schools to projects, or projects to schools, the Board states that "there should be a reasonable relationship between the nature and extent of the services supplied [i.e., the project] and the nature and extent of the needs" of the pupils in the schools.[7] There is little evidence that there is such a relationship; and the procedures established for planning projects and for selecting schools decrease the probability of its occurrence. In 1967-68 there were 298 eligible public elementary

---

[6] Heller, op. cit. Contains a complete description of how figures on school participation were obtained, we tallied schools listed in the project descriptions as participants. The Board's figures for 1967-68 differ from the figures cited here; they report the number of qualifying schools, as of the time their Summary was published, as 426.

[7] OSFAP, Summary of Proposed Programs, 1967-68, op. cit.

schools; approximately 250 were selected to participate in some aspect of the Strengthened Early Childhood project. As far as we can determine, there was no difference between the selected and the nonselected schools in terms of location in poverty areas, Special Service designation, grade span, or participation in other programs operating under Title I.

As we will discuss again in the following chapter on Objectives, the separate Bureaus and Divisions of the Board of Education often initiate and implement the Title I proposals. For example, projects involving elementary school students are developed by the Elementary Schools Division and the Program Development Section of OSFAP; the program coordinator is usually a member of the Division. Guidance projects involving elementary-age pupils are planned and administered by the Bureau of Child Guidance or by the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance. The Bureaus select the schools to participate in their projects. Since the Bureaus are independent of one another, an eligible school may be selected for several projects or for none at all.

The effects of the school selection procedures vary. There are instances, as in the Strengthened Early Child, Auxiliary Aide, and Pre-kindergarten projects where these projects, operating in many of the same schools, complement each other, although certain supervisory and coordination efforts may be duplicated. At the other extreme are the summer projects for preschoolers, which have often resulted in competition for children. (See chapter on Early Childhood Programs.) As a result of the way schools are selected, difficulties in articulation, by grade and by subject matter area, within a school and between school levels, are increased. For example, a school may participate in a project focused in the first three grades and in another project emphasizing activities for older children, without having specific services for those in between. Moreover, when a particular project is recycled, the trend has been to recycle it at the original grade levels. Thus, a particular child in grade 2 when an early childhood project was initiated, may not participate again if he is promoted to grade 3, whether or not he continues to need the same services. There are some exceptions; the Five Primary Schools and the Follow-Through projects were specifically designed to provide some continuity. In general, articulation of projects has been poor not only within a school but also between different school levels. Projects may be planned for the junior high school level without adequate consideration of the nature of services the feeder elementary schools are receiving. One result is that the school system is constantly proposing projects at higher grade levels than may be necessary, and thus having less money available for the very young children.

In the projects for children attending nonpublic schools there are fewer qualifying schools and fewer available projects. But there are other problems. Most eligible nonpublic schools were scheduled to par-

ticipate in the Corrective Reading, Corrective Mathematics, Speech Therapy, Guidance, and Bus Trips projects each year. Many of the same children participate in more than one project. Since all these projects require the participating child to leave his regular classroom, there is competion for and duplication of services to children as well as disruption of the regular classroom.

Up to this point we have been referring to schools that were "selected to participate" in projects. Not all schools selected actually do participate. As we shall see in the chapter on Implementation, scarce resources often meant that in some selected schools a project did not operate, in whole or in part. There have also been instances, noted in the individual evaluation reports, where some nonpublic schools chose not to participate either in a particular project or in the entire program; participation of public schools was somewhat more prescribed, although they are often able to use assigned personnel flexibly. For example, a principal could use an additional teacher assigned to reduce class size to teach remedial classes, claiming that his school needed the remedial teacher more than a teacher to reduce class size. Although this kind of flexibility may be desirable, its frequent occurrence would seem to indicate that the design of projects and the selection of schools did not pay enough attention to the actual needs of a particular school. As more and more Title I money is decentralized the districts should be more aware of the needs of individual schools, as well as of the available resources.

In establishing eligibility criteria and in selecting schools to participate in Title I-funded projects, the problem is to focus and concentrate the available funds. The intent of the law, emphasized by the federal Guidelines and again in OSFAP's own public statements, is to concentrate services on the neediest children in the neediest schools. With the present criteria, many schools qualify and the current Title I allocation may not be large enough to provide an adequate level of service to all children in all the eligible schools. Two alternatives present themselves. First, if the schools were ranked on the basis of economic deprivation, those ranked highest could be provided with the greatest proportion of the available resources, perhaps in an amount equal to the original per-child allotment, with the remainder of the funds being spread more thinly. Alternatively, the total number of qualifying schools could be reduced by raising the free lunch qualification to 40 or even 50 percent of the enrollment. As it stands now the 30 percent cutoff, which may accurately reflect the average for the LEA, may not guarantee a level of input necessary to ensure a reasonable promise of substantial progress. The consequence of the "something for everyone" philosophy is that few children may actually benefit.

More realistic identification of the needs of poor children should result in putting the funds where they will do the most good. Changes in the design of projects, particularly in the conception of needs and objectives, could minimize duplication and competition for children and

make possible a better use of trained personnel.

IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS FOR PROJECT PLANNING

The ESEA of 1965 clearly states that Title I projects should be planned to meet the educational needs of the target population. According to the Office of Education Instructions, the LEA is to review all relevant evaluative data from previous projects, including data on the "educational performance and behavioral characteristics of children" in the target population,[8] and to provide a program directly related to meeting the needs.

The identification of the needs of a special target population requires a knowledge of the background, performance, abilities, and potential of the children as well as an appreciation of the more general goals of the educational system. The federal Guidelines state this as follows: "The identification and understanding of these special needs requires a knowledge of the children and their backgrounds, much as the diagnosis of physical condition precedes treatment to improve that condition."

Although it was clear that not every child in the target group was educationally deprived in the same way or to the same degree, it was believed that there are special educational needs common to these children as a group but not common to other children. In order to help the local educational agencies, the Office of Education prepared a list of likely characteristics and needs of educationally deprived children. This list grew out of a statement prepared under the direction of the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, and was part of the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress. Table II-1 following lists these characteristics as they appear in the Instructions for Title I applications.[9]

Annually, each LEA submits a list of the characteristics that are most common among its eligible children, and that are severe enough to indicate a need for Title I services. In New York City, OSFAP completes these data, which are available for the 1966-67 and 1967-68 school years. The characteristics of the New York City target population, as listed for 1966-67 in decreasing order at frequency, are: negative attitude

---

[8] Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Instructions for Title I 1968 Application Forms, OE-37003.

[9] Ibid.

TABLE II-1

CHARACTERISTICS OF EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN[a]

Code	CHARACTERISTIC
	Achievement
11	Poor performance on standardized tests
12	Classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading
13	Achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas
14	Other achievement characteristics (specify)
	Ability
21	Poor performance on standardized tests of intellectual ability
22	Low level in verbal functioning
23	Low level in nonverbal functioning
24	Other ability characteristics (specify)
	Attitude
31	Negative self-image
32	Negative attitude toward school and education
33	Low occupational and educational aspiration level
34	Expectations of school failure
35	Other attitude characteristics (specify)
	Behavior
41	High absentee rate
42	High dropout rate
43	Disciplinary problems
44	Short attention span
45	Other behavior characteristics (specify)
	Characteristics Related to Learning Difficulties
51	Poor health
52	Malnutrition
53	Emotional and social instability
54	Lack of clothing
55	Other (specify)
	Handicapped
61	Mentally retarded
62	Hard of hearing
63	Deaf
64	Speech impaired
65	Visually handicapped
66	Seriously emotionally disturbed
67	Crippled
68	Other health impaired

[a] *Instructions*, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

toward school and education, poor performance on standardized tests, achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas [than reading], low level in verbal functioning, low occupational and educational aspiration level, high dropout rate, disciplinary problems, and emotional and social instability. In 1967-68 the characteristics of educationally deprived children were listed as: negative self-image, achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas, poor performance on standardized tests, low level in verbal functioning, speech impaired, and high absentee rate. The composite picture of the Title I child in New York City emerges; currently, he has a negative self-image, is achieving below grade level, does poorly on tests, is either speech impaired or does not function well verbally, and is often absent from school.

This characterization of the New York City target child is, of course, both superficial and overgeneralized. There is no indication that it is based on any systematic assessment of the characteristics of the target children. The list of anticipated characteristics prepared by the Office of Education was not intended to be an inclusive or exhaustive statement -- and it is not. Nor was the list intended to be used in a perfunctory manner. The primary purpose of such a list was to direct the local program planners to consider pupil needs in the designing of projects. As far as we can determine, Title I projects in New York City are neither based on an assessment of pupil need, nor are they particularly closely related to the characteristics the Board lists as describing its eligible children.

Because pupils' needs change, an annual assessment of needs is necessary. Since most projects are planned by school, the assessment should be on a school-by-school basis, and should include estimates of the number of children exhibiting each characteristic. The assessment could take into account factors such as pupil mobility, achievement, attendance, delinquency, and so on; such a procedure would not necessarily be costly since much of the information is regularly collected by the Board anyway. A school profile could be developed that would provide the program planners with sufficient data to plan and assign projects systematically. Furthermore, an annual reassessment would provide an independent criterion against which to measure program effectiveness.

THE PARTICIPATING CHILDREN

Who are the children who participate in Title I-funded activities? How many children participate? In general, it is very difficult to answer these questions. The reason is essentially two-fold. First, in many projects the intended target children were not specified; rather, services were assigned to eligible schools on the assumption that the Title I child attends a Title I school. In the second place, because of the projects' implementation, evaluation, and the kinds of records main-

tained, there are uncertainties about the actual numbers and kinds of pupil participants.

The Board of Education keeps no central records describing the number of schools or classes actually participating in any Title I project. School officials do not systematically maintain records of which classes, grades, or children participated in one or another project. There are records for some projects; when available, information about the participation of a child is most often kept by the person in charge of the project. There may be some indication of the amount of services a child received, but generally there is no information about the progress he made. A description of a child's participation in a project is usually not recorded on his permanent record card. For a particular child, it is often difficult or impossible to know whether he received special additional instruction in reading, or speech, or whether he participated in after-school activities.

Moreover, the school population in New York City is extremely mobile; each year thousands of pupils are admitted to and discharged from the schools. In 1966-67, for example, there were almost 350,000 transfers into, out of, and within the City public school system. Children transfer at all times during the school year, and are continually being reassigned to classes within schools. There is no pupil identification number used to keep track of the school population, and when a child is transferred his permanent records are forwarded with him and no record is maintained at the school he left.

The inadequacies of the record system have implications for program planning and for both immediate and long-term evaluations. Since any school can be and usually is assigned more than one project, a child in that school may participate in several projects. Although the extent of pupil participation in simultaneous multiple projects has not been investigated, some evidence collected incidently indicates that this may be prevalent; in 1966-67, 37 percent of the children in the Corrective Mathematics project were also participants in one other Title I project. It becomes very difficult, therefore, to measure the effects of one project on the child -- especially, as we will indicate in the chapter on Evaluation, when the evaluator is not aware of the existence of the other projects. Furthermore, because records are not kept in a systematic fashion, followup studies cannot provide data about long-term program effects.

In some projects, record-keeping problems are considerably intensified, and affect the project's operation. In the summer and afterschool projects, as well as all others that are not based in the child's home school, it is a common occurrence for pupil records not to be transmitted on time, or at all. As a result, in many instances the project personnel do not have sufficient information about the participants. At the end of these projects, records are also frequently not sent back to

the home school, so that the regular school staff is unaware of progress or problems. This kind of difficulty hindered the Board of Education personnel and the staff of the nonpublic schools from coordinating their efforts in the Evening Guidance Centers project.

The evaluations of individual projects have not provided information about the number of pupils involved in a project, nor do they report on the degree of participation. In many instances evaluations are concerned with samples of schools or classes, although some evaluations do describe the general extent of implementation; the reports may tell us for example, that the project operated in only 90 percent of the schools because not enough specialist personnel were available to serve all schools. The evaluations may report that, as in the 1966-67 evaluation of the Corrective Reading project, 92 percent of the proposed target population was reached.

In order to report the total number of children, toward the latter part of the 1967-68 school year the Board's Bureau of Educational Research attempted to obtain an unduplicated count of all children involved in Title I activities that year. Adding together the number of children listed in the project proposals does not provide this information. First, children may be involved in multiple projects; second, the figures in the proposals are, at best, estimates of intention. For an unduplicated count to be meaningful, it would have to consider degree of participation (e.g., a child attending three of five remedial sessions), quality of participation, and participation in other Title I and non-Title I projects. Without these data, cost-benefit studies would not be valid.

It is not even feasible to obtain counts of the number of children that the Board intended to involve in a project in any one year. The individual project proposals contain space for estimating the number of children to be served. These figures are clearly only estimates, and the number of children actually involved may differ considerably. Since project proposals are prepared in advance of final budget approval, there are bound to be some discrepancies. Small discrepancies may not seriously affect the project's operation, but larger discrepancies may. For example, in both the Benjamin Franklin Cluster project and in College Bound the size of the target populations was estimated in advance, and selection criteria were established. However, in neither project were there actually as many students who met the criteria as had been estimated. The result for College Bound was a target population performing at a level above what was initially conceived. In the Benjamin Franklin Cluster project, on the other hand, the criteria had to be lowered in order to use the project space, thereby lowering the general performance level of the group and changing the original project goals.

There is another group of projects where the number of participants is fewer than the total number of children exhibiting the need for such services. Many of these projects are planned to cope with specific

handicaps of students -- the pregnant teenager, the hard-of-hearing, the suspended student, the non-English-speaking student, and the student with severe speech defects, to mention some of these special efforts. For these projects it is very difficult to specify why one given child is selected for participation while another child is not. Moreover, it is sometimes impossible to specify who did the selection.

Two questions become apparent. One is: Who made the intital estimates? Were the teachers or principals ever asked to estimate the proportion of the children who needed the project's services? In the absence of an overall assessment of the needs of the children, was there any contact with the eligible schools, either in terms of their need for the service at all, or in terms of how many children should be planned for? There is little evidence of this kind of planning. It should take place; better estimates would make possible more realistic allocations of resources, especially in projects for nonpublic school children where personnel days are assigned on the basis of the number of children needing the service. As more Title I funds are decentralized, and each district may have to deploy its own resources to best advantage, a careful estimate of the needs and the number of children exhibiting the needs will be helpful in formulating project plans.

The other important question, related to the making of estimates, is the question of selection criteria for participants. The emphasis we described on refining the criteria for school eligibility has not been paralleled, in the vast majority of Title I projects, by establishing criteria for pupil participation. In many Title I projects the proposal is for entire schools or grade levels; no other criteria for participation are specified and the school administrator can therefore assign the additional personnel to a variety of tasks for any class or group of children. Many of these large projects are nonvisible, that is, neither the target children nor the specific project activities are described in the proposal.

Part of the rationale for these projects is the assumption that all children attending an eligible school are from low-income families and thus are all entitled to Title I services. However, in actuality projects based on this assumption do not provide services to all the children in a school; some selective factor operates. An extreme example of this reasoning occurs in the Open Enrollment project where Title I funds are allocated to schools receiving the Open Enrollment children. Some of the Title I staff were specialists included to provide intensive instruction; others were additional teachers included in the proposal to reduce class size because of the schools' increased registers. This created a paradoxical situation for the schools: if the Open Enrollment children were singled out for service, it might defeat the larger project goal of integration. If, on the other hand, the additional resources were directed to the entire school, there was no guarantee that the Open Enrollment children would receive direct benefits.

Some Title I project proposals do state requirements for pupil participation. The project for pregnant girls, the corrective projects for nonpublic school children, and the College Discovery and Development projects are examples of projects in which selection criteria were stated clearly enough to identify the intended population. The ease with which the actual participant can be described depends in part on the faithfulness with which the criteria were implemented or departures noted. For example, the proposals for the corrective projects specified a degree of retardation in the particular subject but did not specify how retardation was to be measured or judged; this is not in itself necessarily a drawback since some flexibility is desirable. However, the evaluations indicated that estimates of retardation differed for different schools, and that some poor diagnostic techniques were used. Moreover, retardation in the particular subject was not only the only criterion; often the regular classroom teacher referred children who showed discipline problems, or were emotionally disturbed, or had other nonacademic problems. Some departures from stated criteria may be appropriate, but without an understanding of the actual basis for the selection of the participants it is impossible to arrive at conclusive statements about project outcomes.

The law is clear in many respects. It directs the LEAs to identify their economically and educationally deprived school children, assess their needs, and plan a concentrated program to meet the special educational needs of the most severely deprived. New York City has attempted to identify and limit its Title I program primarily by making its school eligibility requirements more strict, thereby limiting the number of qualifying schools and children. At the same time, the Board of Education has reduced the total number of different projects and activities in the hope of concentrating its resources.

The most ignored part of the mandate is to assess the nature and extent of the needs of the target population and to concentrate activities on meeting these needs. Legislatively, concentration meant that projects be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the needs. Implicit in the legislation is that an appropriate level of effort would be equivalent to the LEA's per-child allotment. That is, if New York City receives $250 per child, that much should be expended for each child in addition to what his education normally costs the City. For some projects the City probably spends considerably more per child, while for other projects the per-child expenditure is probably less. The necessary level of effort will probably differ with the type of need exhibited and the severity of the need. These questions are amenable to research.

The evidence from a study of three years and one hundred projects suggests that more progress is made in those projects in which the needs of the children are identifiable and describable. The reason for the increased likelihood of success in projects such as those for preg-

nant girls, or for children with special hearing limitations, or for those with college potential may be that once the need is apparent, appropriate and intensive strategies can be developed for meeting the problem. This evidence has an extremely important implication for the future.

To attempt to meet all the needs of all the target children at the same time would require much more money and much more understanding than is currently available. Without further limiting the number of participants in Title I projects, the present resources could be concentrated by treating each child's most pressing need. This is no easy task. It involves developing diagnostic instruments or techniques for identifying major needs. It also requires a firm understanding of how children learn so that we can set priorities and make decisions such as whether to attempt to treat a child's absenteeism or first attempt to work on his reading problem.

From the information available to us we believe that this approach to need assessment and program design is worthy of consideration. It permits concentration of activity without further limiting the number of children who can be involved in Title I projects. Further, it would permit a child to see his own progress -- an important motivational factor that might have beneficial carryover effects in meeting his other problems.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIVES: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter we will examine the process of program development with special emphasis on project objectives. Some understanding of the historical setting and background is necessary for an appreciation of the recurrent problems involved.

With the passage of the ESEA in April 1965, the New York City Board of Education was faced with the challenge of immediately developing and implementing $65 million worth of programming beginning with the 1965-66 school year. In the school year 1964-65, prior to the ESEA, the New York City Board of Education was already operating many special programs for disadvantaged school children. Almost 300 of the elementary and junior high schools in the City had been designated Special Service schools, so classified on the basis of pupils' reading and language limitations and other criteria, and were receiving additional allocations of presonnel and materials. There were 100 prekindergarten classes in 34 schools in less privileged areas of the City. There were special school retention projects and guidance centers for out-of-school youth. The free-choice Open Enrollment project and a School Utilization Program, designed to promote integration, had been in effect for several years. The summer school program for elementary, junior high, and high school students had started the previous summer, and afterschool study centers were operating in many areas. Special efforts designed to upgrade education had resulted in the Higher Horizons and More Effective Schools programs. Attention was being directed to students with social, emotional, and health problems; early identification, and career guidance programs had been established; there were classes for handicapped youth, hospitalized youth, and children who were socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed, as well as a project for children learning English as a second language. These projects were financed primarily from the regular school budget, since federal aid to New York City in 1964-65 amounted to only 0.5 percent of the schools' total operating expense budget.

Assuming that ongoing expenditures for projects that fell within the aims of the new legislation would be continued, Title I funds were to be spent to expand and improve the educational programs for disadvantaged children in the elementary and secondary schools. Largely as a result of uncertainties about funding, and limits on staff and time, most of the first year's projects were expansions of activities already in small-scale operation or previously contemplated. The budget for the ten largest projects was over $50 million. In decreasing order of funding they were: Comprehensive High Schools, More Effective Schools, Improved Services, Transitional Schools, Open Enrollment, Head Start, Middle Schools, the Summer School Program, the program for the Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, and the summer Teacher Training Institutes.

The Middle Schools project and the Comprehensive High Schools project were not compensatory programs, but were aimed at reorganizing the school system into a 4-4-4 grade structure in accord with the Allen plan of 1964. There were many other instances in the first year where Title I money was used to expand ongoing citywide programs. For example, in the Summer School projects and in the After School Study Centers, which had existed prior to the ESEA, Title I funds were used in schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods while tax levy funds were used to support the identical program in other areas of the City. The Open Enrollment project had been completely funded by tax levy funds since 1960; More Effective Schools started in ten schools in 1964 with tax levy funds; and in 1964 Head Start was supported by Office of Economic Opportunity funds. When Title I funds became available they were used to expand these projects.

In other of the large projects, such as Transitional Schools and Improved Services, nonteaching positions, such as secretaries and assistants-to-principals, were budgeted under Title I. This practice continued, although on a much reduced scale, into the 1967-68 school year. It seems unlikely that the drafters of the ESEA anticipated using Title I to strengthen the school administration or to fund citywide changes in the organizational structure of the schools, even assuming that the LEA desperately needed to undertake these activities.

By the second school year there were some changes in program emphases, although most of the 1965-66 projects were recycled. The projects with the largest budgets, totalling approximately $58 million, included Improved Services, Comprehensive High Schools, Transitional Schools, More Effective Schools, Open Enrollment, Middle Schools, Prekindergarten, Head Start, After School Study Centers and the Summer School projects. Several modifications were incorporated in the proposals for these projects, including more school aides, more experienced teachers, and increased allotments for supplies and materials.

The spring semester of the 1966-67 year forecast many future changes; for the first time Title I funds were decentralized; some funds were allotted for planning activities, including planning of the summer College Bound project and the project for paraprofessionals; increased monies were assigned to projects for physically and emotionally handicapped children; and there were renewed attempts to involve both public and nonpublic school children at the same project site.

In the third year there was more emphasis on defining school eligibility. More attention was paid to the needs of specific schools, which took the form of an increased number of single-school projects. Some flexibility was built into programs -- as evidenced by the mandated District Decentralized projects and the provision for schools with insufficient registers for inschool programs to conduct afterschool activities at a central location.

Drastic changes in the content of programs were made in 1967-68. In

line with the newly established Board of Education priorities, almost $18 million was budgeted for early childhood programs, while approximately $16 million more went into District Decentralized activities.[1] There was an increase in the number of medium-sized projects, with a corresponding decrease in the number of large projects. The largest project was Compensatory Education, budgeted at about $15 million. This project is illustrative of the beginning of a movement away from using Title I funds for activities that were not well focused, i.e., not visible. In the first two years, a large proportion of Title I money was used for projects which were not easily separable from the ongoing activities in the schools; in many instances, Title I was used to add positions to many schools, scattering them across grades and subject areas. According to OSFAP's own analysis,[2] during 1966-67 almost $40 million of Title I funds was budgeted for such unfocused services to schools with large numbers of poverty children. For the 1967-68 school year, the Board intended to budget approximately $16 million for such services, a reduction of more than 50 percent; of this amount, almost all was allotted to one project, Compensatory Education. This reduction represents an attempt to consolidate and reduce the expenditures for the nonvisible Title I projects. The Board anticipates that the entire burden for these activities will eventually be transferred to the regular school budget.[3]

DESIGNATION OF PROGRAM PRIORITIES

The federal Guidelines define a program as the sum of the LEA's projects which contribute to its overall plan for meeting the special educational need of educationally deprived children. Does New York City needs have such an overall plan for its Title I activities? As we have indicated, for the first two years New York City tended to expand and improve on programs in prior operation. Starting with the 1967-68 year the Board of Education and the CAP formulated a set of priorities to govern the development of Title I activities. (See chapter on Community Participation in Title I.) The priorities apply primarily to activities for children in the public schools. Since the ESEA limits the nature of services to children attending nonpublic schools, only within these limits may priorities be established; the specific projects for nonpublic school children are planned by the Standing Committee of Nonpublic School

---

[1] A separate chapter of the report is devoted to each program area.

[2] OSFAP, Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-68, op. cit.

[3] Ibid.

Representatives and OSFAP. Following are the priorities which, with only a slight modification, are still maintained:

> Programs for early childhood education.
>
> Programs for academic improvement, with emphasis on reading and other basic skills.
>
> Programs involving a decentralized approach to budgeting and programming.
>
> Development of a career ladder for nonprofessionals with emphasis on careers in education for people from the community.
>
> Programs fostering community involvement in the schools.
>
> Teacher training and retraining, in the light of the priorities noted above.

Our classification of the Title I projects into program areas for this report parallels the stated priorities. The reader is reminded that since we decided to classify each project in only one program area some arbitrary decisions were made; thus the classification by primary focus ignores many other aspects -- often significant in scope -- that pertain to other program areas. As the data in Table III-1 on the following page indicate, there is a close correspondence between our program area categories and the priorities. Starting with the 1967-68 school year, the actual allocation of Title I funds conforms to the Board's statement of intent.

The primary question about these stated priorities is whether they relate to the needs of the target children, especially the most pressing educational needs. The Formal statement of priorities is concerned with input procedures and techniques; there is no assurance that concentrating activities along these lines will bring about change in children. It is an assumption that the technique of a decentralized approach, for example, or community involvement, or teacher training will result in desired pupil performance.

PROJECT DESIGN

The federal Guidelines suggest that each project be judged on its ability to contribute toward achieving the goals of the total program. In designing each individual project the LEA is responsible for selecting objectives based on its estimates of pupil need. The Office of Education has provided a list of project objectives which parallel its statement of the characteristics generally associated with educationally deprived children (see previous chapter.) Table III-2 on page 35 summarizes the list of program objectives, with their code numbers.

TABLE III-1

AMOUNT AND PROPORTION OF TITLE I FUNDS BUDGETED BY PROGRAM CONTENT AREA, 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

PROGRAM AREAS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES	Funds Budgeted by School Year: 1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Early Childhood	9,275	14	8,599	11	18,217	25
Regular Academic	39,042	58	43,206	57	27,058	37
Motivational Academic	830	1	1,877	2	5,409	7
Supplementary Academic	7,603	11	9,576	13	2,394	3
Enrichment	352	1	121	0	118	0
Speech	379	1	645	1	210	0
Guidance	3,360	5	7,224	10	2,807	4
Special Needs	-	-	181	0	96	0
Teacher Training	6,091	9	1,820	2	453	1
Parents and Paraprofessionals	-	-	502	1	677	1
District Decentralized	-	-	1,496	2	16,197	22
Planning and Testing	-	-	129	0	63	0
TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED[c]	$66,932	100%	$75,376	99%	$73,698	100%

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget (see chapter on Implementation.)
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Percentages do not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE III-2

PROJECT OBJECTIVES FOR EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN - ESEA TITLE I[a]

Code	OBJECTIVES
	Achievement
11	To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests
12	To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations
13	To improve classroom performance in other skill areas beyond usual expectations
14	Other achievement objectives (specify)
	Ability
21	To improve performance as measured by standardized tests of intellectual ability
22	To improve children's verbal functioning
23	To improve children's nonverbal functioning
24	Other objectives related to abilities (specify)
	Attitudes
31	To improve the children's self-image
32	To change (in a positive direction) their attitudes toward school and education
33	To raise their occupational and/or educational aspirational levels
34	To increase their expectations of success in school
35	Other objectives related to children's attitudes (specify)

Code	OBJECTIVES
	Behavior
41	To improve the children's average daily attendance
42	To improve the holding power of schools (to decrease the dropout rate)
43	To reduce the rate and severity of disciplinary problems
44	To improve and increase the children's attention span
45	Other objectives related to children's behavior (specify)
	Conditions Related to Learning
51	To improve the physical health of the children
52	To improve the nutritional health of the children
53	To improve the children's emotional and social stability and/or that of their families
54	To provide adequate clothing for the children
55	Other objectives related to learning conditions (specify)

[a] Instructions, op. cit., p.13

The mandate behind the instructions issued to the LEAs was excellent: assess the needs of your children, design a plan to meet the needs, and match specific project objectives to the overall plan. In furnishing a precoded set of project objectives, the Office of Education was attempting to provide a standard framework in which the LEAs' project could be designed, implemented, and evaluated. In fairness it should be said that the list of objectives was probably intended as a shorthand statement. While there is overlap between some objectives on the list and while others are stated too generally, the principal disadvantage of the precoded listing has not been in the wording but rather in the automatic way it has been used.

In the first place, there has been confusion between means on the one hand, and ends or objectives on the other. For example, in applying for Title I funds the Board of Education has most frequently proposed the following objectives: to improve classroom performance and/or achievement on standardized tests in reading and other skill areas; to improve self-image and to increase expectations of success in school; to improve attitudes toward school and education; to improve attendance; to increase the holding power of the schools; to raise occupational and/or educational aspiration levels; and to improve the parent-school relationship. In the 1967-68 school year, in conformity to the new priorities, the Board began to add the following objectives: to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, to provide teacher aide services and instructional materials, and to provide innovative teaching techniques, approaches, and methods of instruction.

A brief consideration will show that in many of these statements, especially the ones more recently adopted, there is confusion between what an objective is and what constitutes a means to the objective. Improving pupil performance as measured by standardized reading or mathematics tests is an objective; training teachers for remedial classes is one of the means to accomplish it. Improving pupil attitudes toward education is an objective, which may be accomplished by reducing class size, or adding paraprofessionals or tutors, and so on. Program planners have not differentiated objectives for pupils from pedagogical techinques or procedures.

In the second place, applications for individual Title I projects have been unclear in stating what they seek to accomplish. The way objectives are stated is of crucial importance to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of a project. The objectives often determine the target population, the procedures and techniques necessary to implement the project, and the kinds of criteria developed for assessing success.

For each Title I project each year an individual project application is prepared. This constitutes an official description of the project; it is a guide to what is to be accomplished and how this is to be done. The formal project application form, or proposal, requires that

objectives to be stated in several places and in different ways. They are summarized as major aims, are listed by code number, and are amplified in the narrative description section of the proposal. Objectives may be stated or implied in other portions of the proposal as well. For example, the sections devoted to project procedures, to budget, and to evaluation not only specify the intended activities, but help define their relative scope and importance. In some project applications, however, objectives were listed but with no provision for implementation in terms of time, staff, or budget allocation. The projects designed to foster integration are an example. A major aim of these projects (see chapter on Regular Academic Programs) was to foster integration among school children; the project procedures, however, were written in terms of academic achievement. No funds were set aside and no plans were developed specifically to foster integration. As a consequence, there was great variation among schools not only in the ways they chose to implement this goal, but whether they emphasized it at all. In addition, the evaluators did not assess the projects' attainments in terms of integration; for example, in the first year's evaluation of the Title I Open Enrollment project, no count was made of the number of children who attended integrated schools under this program.

There are other examples where objectives were not supported by direct provision for implementation. These objectives, which we will call "unspecified," can be defined as those for which no means of implementation are evident. It is not clear whether unspecified objectives are to be either implemented or evaluated. In the Open Enrollment example above, the unspecified objective was generally neither implemented nor evaluated, although it probably should have been. On the other hand, the Corrective Mathematics project lists, among other objectives, the improvement of pupils' reading skills; no special work on reading was included. In this project it is fairly clear that the reading objective was not to be evaluated. As a general principle, all objectives in a proposal should be implemented and evaluated. Whether to implement or evaluate any particular objective should not be determined by the ease of doing so. If these kinds of aims continue to be included in project proposals, the situation would be clarified if they were treated as a "general hope"rather than as a definite objective.

In examining the separate project proposals one is struck by the lack of conformity between statements of objectives located in the different sections of the proposals, as well as by the difference in the degree to which they are specified. In addition, the proposals list the objectives without any explicit indication of their relative importance. This has serious implications for ensuring that a project will be carried out in the schools as it was designed. Differences between statements of objectives, and differences in interpretations of the importance of each objective, may be important reasons why schools participating in any

one project vary so greatly in how they implement the project, and hence why they vary so greatly in outcome.

Lack of clarity or specificity in stating objectives may lead to nothing more than vague statements describing what took place and what was achieved. Evaluators can reach conclusive statements as to the attainment of objectives only if the objectives are clear, specific, delimited, and stated behaviorally. School administrators cannot implement a project as planned unless they are provided with clear and specific guides. Many school administrators have never seen a statement of project objectives. If the objectives are to serve as a guide for project implementation, they are of no value unless they are systematically disseminated to the staff involved in carrying out the project.

OBJECTIVES RELATED TO PROJECT PROCEDURES

There is one, and only one, legitimate goal for Title I: the meeting of children's educational needs through modification of their school experience. Need is used here in its most general sense, and includes classroom performance, subject skills, and attitude toward the self, the *school, education, and society. School experience* is also used in a general sense to include such things as preschooling and increased parental involvement in the educational process. With Title I funds, each and every input into the academic experience should have as its ultimate aim a change in the pupil's academic performance.

Before considering the interrelationship between objectives and the techniques to reach them, it may be well to examine, as an example, the Strengthened Early Childhood project. In this project, the stated objective was to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in first and second grade classes. Obviously, this is not a legitimate end goal for a Title I activity; in fact, this statement is a description of a procedure to be used to accomplish something else, and implicit in the statement is a series of assumptions which relate, directly or indirectly, to improving the school performance of first and second graders. The underlying assumptions may be that (1) it is possible to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio; (2) the reduced ratio will afford the teacher the opportunity to individualize instruction or make other instructional modifications; and (3) modifications in instructional techniques result in desirable changes in the child's academic performance.

In the project's statement of objectives and in the Board's stated priorities there is a nagging, persistent failure to distinguish between the means for accomplishing something, and the goal to be accomplished. Means and goals are related, and it is important to highlight the nature of the relationship for several reasons: Title I successes are often reported in terms of how many guidance counselors were provided, how many books were ordered, or how many classes were reduced in size as a result of the program. Perhaps of more importance, all too often there is no distinction between failure to implement a project and

project failure, i.e., failure to modify pupil behavior. Compensatory programs are frequently unsuccessful because they were never implemented; the most obvious examples of this are the Five Primary Schools project and the Academic Achievement project.[4] In many other projects complete implementation is not achieved.

It is with the stage of project implementation that the monitoring role for evaluators could be developed. Measuring the extent of implementation is relatively simple and quantitative. By definition, such measurement is short-term, for this kind of implementation must take place well within the span of the project. Teachers and counselors and books can be counted, ratios determined, attendance taken, and the information can be fed back immediately to responsible people who can take any necessary corrective action to ensure that the project is being put into effect. There is a qualitative aspect to implementation that should also be noted; the experience of teachers and counselors, the relevancy of the books, and the way the reduced ratio is achieved, in addition to how many, may have some bearing on the outcomes.

In our example of the Strengthened Early Childhood project, and in many other projects as well, there are intermediate effects of implementation which may be still somewhat removed from the ultimate change in pupils. Certain changes in the educational agents, people or practices, are assumed to result from the procedures and techniques. In the example cited above, modified teaching practice should result from the reduction in pupil-teacher ratio. The modified teaching practice should, in turn, have a direct influence on the child. Teacher training, career ladder, and parent involvement projects seek to effect changes in the educational agents so as to improve the child's performance. Other types of projects are directed to eliminating obstacles to learning. It is believed, for example, that poor health, poor diet, inadequate motivation, and emotional problems affect a child's ability to profit from educational opportunities. Removal or amelioration of the debilitating effects of these obstacles -- just as with modification of instructional techniques -- is a necessary precursor to improvement in a child's educational performance.

Many Title I projects fail to promote these kinds of changes. The Strengthened Early Childhood project did reduce the pupil-teacher ratios, but reduced ratios per se resulted in no demonstrable changes in teaching behaviors, and no measured changes in pupil performance. Similiarly, the More Effective Schools project modified the climate of the school and the classroom, but without specific additional training the teachers did not change their teaching styles.

Assessment of intermediate effects on the educational agents or on pupils involves estimates of change; these effects are therefore, not as easy to measure as the number of pupils in a classroom. In the past,

---

[4]Nathan Kravetz and Edna Phillips, Special Primary Program in Five Schools, 1968-69. Center for Urban Education, October 1969. Louise Fox, Programs to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools, 1968-69. Center for Urban Education, October 1969.

measures of intermediate program effects have usually consisted of self-reports and reports or ratings by others. Since it is so important to assess change here, normative instruments, standards of comparison, and baseline data need to be developed.

The final concern is of course with changes in pupils' academic performance. More attention needs to be given to specifying desirable behaviors as they relate to pupil needs, and to developing new criterion measures and new estimates of effectiveness. Since attainment of the ultimate goal may not occur within one year, additional research is necessary to determine after what period of time, and after what amount of effort a change in pupil performance can be expected. We need to know not only how long it takes to improve achievement, but also how durable the effects will be. A reading project, or Head Start, may show improvement in achievement by the end of the project year; however, these projects are truly successful only if the immediate gains last. The success of College Discovery and Development can be measured by how many students enter college each year, but how many graduate is a problem of durability extending beyond the one-year mandated evaluation.

Success with Title I, in the above view, is relative and cumulative. If project objectives can be stated in successive levels of expectation, continuous modifications and improvements are possible. We believe that such an approach would focus the attention of program planners and evaluators on testing the relationships between what is to be done and what is expected to result from it. A large part of the effort of program development should be concerned with evolving new techniques and strategies designed to accomplish the objectives. At the same time, a large part of the evaluation effort should be directed to testing the underlying relationships between means to the end and the end itself.

SIZE, SCOPE, AND QUALITY

Section 205 (a) of the ESEA states that projects are to be "of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting" the educational needs of deprived children. The federal Guidelines interpret this concept of concentration of effort to mean that the total program should be planned in such a way as to ensure that all the needs of the children are being met, and use the following example. If a remedial reading project is so widespread and expensive as to exclude eyeglasses or motivational activities, without which the child would be unlikely to benefit from remedial instruction, then this approach is ineffective because it ignores the other special needs of the children. In our opinion, to concentrate effort in this way might require limiting the size of the target population, in view of the limited resources of the ESEA and of the school system.

Alternatively, since the concept of concentration of effort is applicable to the intensity of the project activities as well, it might

be worth considering concentrating activities on a child's primary need and providing services intensive enough to effect change. To do this, we need to know whether, for example, one hour per week of remedial instruction is adequate to effect improvement in a child two years retarded. We need to know if the services of one guidance counselor can effect change in 200 pupils; or whether the reduction of class size by an average of 1.5 pupils will really permit the teacher to individualize instruction.

The question of whether Title I activities are sufficiently concentrated is immensely complex. We do not have adequate records of children's participation in projects, nor do we have data on the cost of activities. We have a few estimates of the extent of project implementation, but not in a form in which we can do the studies that we feel are necessary. Moreover, we do not know enough about educating the educationally deprived. There have been few systematic attempts to relate the amount and quality of input to the kind of desired output. Educators may be committed to the belief that small class size is beneficial, for example, without knowing whether a reduction of one or two, or five or ten children alone makes a significant difference in teaching style or results. We know the guidance counselor to pupil ratio that is usual, but we do not know if this is the optimal ratio. We assume that teacher training is related to improvements of some kind for the child; we do not know whether teacher training results in changed classroom behavior of teachers, and we are far from being able to match the type and quality of teacher training with the desired modifications in pupil behavior. These questions extend beyond the scope of Title I. Title I activities, however, should be planned in a way that will shed some light on these issues.

CATEGORIZATION OF PROJECTS BY NEEDS

Many Title I projects state the same aim and purport to meet similar pupil needs. As an example, let us examine the objective "to improve verbal functioning." During the 1966-67 school year this statement appeared in the list of objectives of the following projects: Improved Services, Open Enrollment, More Effective Schools, Middle Schools, Basic Speech Improvement, Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, Corrective Mathematics, Speech Therapy, Evening Guidance, and TV and AV Teacher Training. "Improved verbal functioning," however, does not have the same meaning in these different projects. What accounts for the difference in meaning?

First, the groups of children served by these various projects differ widely. They attend public and nonpublic schools; they range in grade from early elementary through the junior high school level and include nongraded classes as well. The children may be normal or may suffer from physical and emotional handicaps. Their problems may include severe speech difficulties, minor speech problems such as accents, difficulty in classroom expression, or language problems secondary to other academic problems.

Second, the relative importance of improved verbal functioning varies; in the Corrective Mathematics project this particular objective, if it is more than a general hope, is obviously secondary to the objective of improving achievement in mathematics. In the Basic Speech Improvement and Speech Therapy projects, the improvement of verbal functioning is the most important goal, although its precise meaning depends on the needs of a specific group of children.

Third, the meaning of the objective may differ according to the procedures and pedagogical techniques proposed for achieving it. Inservice training of teachers may be the technique employed; other techniques may include the assignment of special speech teachers or of additional teachers to reduce class size. Other projects might propose to improve children's verbal functioning by alloting more instructional materials and supplies, or by changing the classroom organization.

A final factor differentiating the meaning of the objective is the changes expected in student's performance. How an objective is evaluated defines in part what is, or could have been, meant by the objective. In some instances, it would be appropriate to measure verbal functioning by counting the number of questions asked by pupils or the frequency of their responses. The same measures may not be applicable to the Speech Therapy project where more sophisticated evaluation techniques might better be employed.

One solution to many of these problems may be to fashion the projects around the objectives, for example, by gathering together as one project all services meant to improve speech. The different speech needs of the target population will determine the different procedures for implementation and the different techniques for evaluation.

There are advantages to this or to a similar kind of grouping around primary objectives that go beyond this report. For program implementers more effective deployment could be made of scarce specialist personnel; there would be less duplication of effort, less competition for children, and increased opportunity to tailor project activities to specific pupil needs. Projects could be aimed at meeting the child's major need, and the level of services could be greatly intensified. Within such a framework, more innovative approaches, on a pilot basis, would be practicable. In evaluating projects within such a single area, more critically decisive comparisons could be made between various approaches and techniques, relating outcomes to the inputs. And decision makers would have available the necessary information on which to base future allocations of funds.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION: PLANNING, ADMINISTRATION, AND FINANCES

All local educational agencies have problems in implementing Title I projects. Some of the problems are beyond their control and result from the legislative process, the annual funding cycle, and some uncertainty in the relationship that is mandated among the three levels of government involved. New York City has unique problems in getting projects carried out as originally designed. Many of its problems relate to the great size and complexity of its school system, while others result from the particular local arrangements made for administering and operating the program.

In this chapter we shall examine some of New York City's special difficulties in planning and implementing the Title I program as well as other general problems likely to be faced by all LEAs.

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Prior to the actual signing of the ESEA into law, and in the absence both of guidelines and of an appreciation of the scope of the anticipated program, the Board of Education's first major decision was whether to create a new organization to administer Title I, or to try to incorporate the new responsibilities into the existing structure. In large measure, the Board chose the latter policy. From the very beginning, Title I activities were not treated separately from other educational matters; Title I program content and administrative responsibility have been very much a part of the City's educational system, as will become clear through examination of the organizational structure.

Although committees were organized and meetings scheduled, it was not until June 1965, two months after the passage of the Act, that the first Title I coordinator was appointed. Assisted by a small staff selected for their familiarity with other federal and state reimbursement programs, this group became the nucleus of the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs (OSFAP). In December 1966, too late to effect changes for the second, 1966-67, Title I school year, an Assistant Superintendent was appointed to take charge of these activities. This Office remained essentially unchanged until the start of the 1969-70 school year when it became part of a new Division of Funded Programs, State and Federal. Over the years, there was an increase in the size of OSFAP and in their responsibilities. For example, OSFAP became directly responsible for the administration of Title III of the ESEA, and for the 1968 State Urban Education Program.[1] The State Urban Education Program re-

[1] Subdivision 11, Section 3602, Education Law, New York State.

quirements generally parallel those for Title I -- the funds are for programs for school children who meet the criteria of educational underachievement due to conditions of poverty. This program, under the sponsorship of the New York State Education Department, made almost $44 million available to New York City to operate the program the first year. As we shall see later, beginning in the summer 1968 many programs were transferred back and forth between these two sources of funds.

Prior to Title I, special educational programs were under the jurisdiction of the different Offices, Bureaus, or Divisions of the Board of Education. Thus, for example, the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance administered many of the special guidance programs. The same pattern of responsibility was carried over into Title I, since most of the first year's Title I projects were expansions of programs already in operation. Despite the formation of OSFAP to supervise and coordinate the Title I activities, other units within the Board of Education's organizational structure were, and continue to be, responsible for specific aspects of Title I. These Offices and Bureaus play a large role in proposing and developing plans for new projects. They initiate most of the projects funded under Title I, select the participating schools, propose the kinds and numbers of staff needed, and decide on the instructional strategies and materials. Moreover, the Bureaus are largely responsible for the projects' day-to-day operation.

We have already indicated some of the difficulties resulting from the school selection process, including the competition for staff and pupils and the duplication of services. There is another more theoretical and perhaps more important implication which stems directly from this organizational pattern: namely, these Offices plan, administer, and operate the regular educational program in New York City, which itself may not be meeting the needs of the City's children -- hence the need for ESEA in the first instance. The same groups exercise relative control over Title I programming, and this arrangement seems, by its very nature, to foster "more of the same." It may thus be a real advantage for Title I to operate outside the system.[2] One of the promises of the decentralized approach to programming is that new groups of interested people may take a fresh look at the problems and develop more innovative solutions.

Although OSFAP is the central administrative unit, its control over and coordination of projects is limited and primarily nonprogrammatic. The more important decisions about general priorities remain with the members of the Board of Education who set general policy for the public schools. Much of OSFAP's staff effort is directed to inter-

---

[2] In some cities, according to a report in the New York Times, (December 28, 1969, P.1), Title I operates as a separate school system. The Times' article reports that programs operated outside the framework of the educational structure may be more effective than those operating inside. Additional evidence on this important issue is necessary.

preting federal and state requirements, establishing local guidelines and standards, completing and maintaining the innumerable records and forms required, and arranging meetings and conferences; little effort has gone into more substantive matters. Most of the funds allocated for their administrative functions have been expended. The total budget for administration, for each of the three years under investigation, has been approximately $2 to $3 million, or approximately 3 to 4 percent of all Title I funds budgeted. This central administration budget (CAB) covers the cost of evaluations and salaries for nonpublic school liaison personnel, as well as all the other general costs for administering and coordinating Title I activities.

By amendment of 1966, one percent of the LEA's total grant or $2,000, whichever was greater, could be used for planning. In 1966-67, for example, $30,000 was set aside for planning the College Bound project, and another $11,000 for planning the Auxiliary Aide project. The planning allowance has not been fully used in New York City. By taking advantage of the ESEA's planning provision, OSFAP would have the fiscal resources for more creative planning and programming.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Although there have been some notable exceptions -- the Council Against Poverty was directly responsible for initiating the Spanish-Speaking Teachers and the Pregnant Girls projects -- most Title I project ideas originate internally within the school system. The Division that initiates the project idea works with the Program Development Section of OSFAP to develop the specific project plans, write the objectives and techniques to be used to implement them, select the schools, and describe the criteria for pupil elibibility. Other Divisions are involved in formulating the final proposal application, which includes a detailed budget and an evaluation design.

If the Executive Deputy Superintendent of Schools in New York City and the policy-making Board approve the project idea, copies of a one-page summary and tentative budget are circulated to civic and parent groups. Prior to the public meeting of the Board of Education at which these projects are discussed, and during the period the proposal is being considered by the community groups, the one-page summary proposal and budget are undergoing the detailed processing required by the State Education Department and the U.S. Office of Education. At the same time that formal resolution of project plans is being sought at the public meeting of the Board of Education, informal approval from the state is also being obtained. CAP and other groups have voiced discontent with this process and with the timing of it (see chapter on Community Participation in Title I), indicating that these procedures do not permit them

the opportunity to play a cooperative role in the initiation and development of project proposals.

It is possible for a project to get under way, based on informal assurances of approval by the State Education Department (SED). Formal written approval from the SED depends on the Board's resolution of endorsement and receipt of the completed proposal and proper forms. During the operation of a project many revisions are made, especially in the budget. Until 1967-68, all modifications in budget or scope of activities made after approval had to be resubmitted for SED approval. Thereafter,to minimize delays and to allow the LEA some flexibility, the SED gave New York City permission to modify budgets in an already approved project up to an amount equal to 10 percent of the total project cost without obtaining written approval.

Theoretically, final approval of a project by the SED constitutes an agreement that the LEA will be reimbursed for all project costs upon submission of satisfactory fiscal records. However, it is conceivable that some money, actually expended for the furtherance of a Title I activity, may be disallowed at the time of audit, especially if, as was the case in 1965-66, adequate fiscal records were not maintained; for that year it was not possible to prove that some of the expended money was spent on Title I programs. It is also possible that, since final approval by the SED occurs long after the project has actually begun operation, some of the money already expended may not be reimbursed if the project is not approved.

STATE PROGRAM REVIEW

The SED has broad authority and responsibility under Title I. Specifically, the state department is responsible for determining if the LEA has met the conditions of the ESEA, and if the LEA has developed projects of sufficient size, scope, and quality to meet the needs of its target children. The SED was also granted great powers of program review, evaluation, and some responsibility for the arbitration of differences at the local level.

It is generally conceded that the State Education Department does not exercise the full range of power given to it by law. The SED has recently become more involved with project evaluation, establishing new deadlines for reporting, and insisting on "hard data." All too often the SED rubber stamps project proposals, and they have never, to our knowledge, refused eventual approval of a project. The SED does not examine project applications carefully; for example, they approve proj-

ects in which the objectives have no provision for implementation. Nor has the SED questioned the selection of schools nor the criteria for eligibility, although the federal government has done so. In those instances where the SED has suggested a revision in a proposal, it is often of a minor and inconsequential nature; in one project, for example, the SED noted that some of the supplementary reading material for students was uninteresting and out of date.[3]

There are instances where a project should be discontinued from Title I funding either because it has not succeeded, or under the specific local conditions cannot possibly succeed, or because it has been demonstrated a success and should perhaps be available to all children. Neither state nor local responsibility has been made clear with respect to project discontinuance.

The Strengthened Early Childhood project is an example of a project which apparently cannot be implemented as intended without resulting in two classes and two teachers occupying one classroom, since the number of classrooms needed to implement this project may not be available. Is it the responsibility of the SED, if the LEA chooses to recycle this project, either to suggest that a new, different, and more likely-to-succeed project be undertaken for the early childhood grades, or, alternatively, to help the LEA find funds to build additional classrooms? We cannot provide the answers to these problems, but we do believe they are worthy of consideration.

The College Discovery and Development project is an example of a project which has apparently proved successful (see chapter on Motivational Academic Programs). Is it to be indefinitely funded as a special Title I project, or should it be transferred to the tax levy budget for all the children and the freed Title I money used for another innovative experiment? Neither the ESEA nor the federal Guidelines provide any resolution to this aspect of program review.

There is little evidence to suggest that the SED fulfills its role as arbitrator of local disagreements. In the year in which a sizable proportion of Title I funds was decentralized, disagreements arose between the Board of Education and community groups over the nature of some changes made by the Board in some project applications after community approval -- the Board maintained that the changes were minor and involved revisions in salary scales and other predetermined costs, while the community agencies contended that the changes were more substantive. The SED did not enter the controversy, although the community

---

[3] Personal communication, OSFAP.

groups petitioned them to do so.

STATE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The other major area of SED responsibility, as mandated by law, is fiscal. The SED is required to make certain that the LEA is not violating the concept of "maintenance of effort." The SED is also required to advance and reimburse funds to the LEAs and to maintain and control audits.

Maintenance of effort means that Title I funds are to be added to the money already being spent by the LEA for educational programs for the deprived. This concept is basic to the ESEA. The federal Guidelines state that if the LEA is operating a program whose aim falls within the purposes of this legislation, Title I funds may be used to expand and improve the project but the LEA must maintain the fiscal effort it was putting into these activities before the passage of the Act. Moreover, the LEA has an obligation to support some activities for the disadvantaged child on its own; the LEA should not transfer to Title I the entire burden of, for example, all its activities designed to foster integration. As we shall see in the Regular Academic Program chapter, almost all integration efforts in this City have become Title I efforts. Theoretically, if the LEA were to withdraw its previous fiscal support from a project it would be reflected in the regular education budget. However, in New York City as in other LEAs, the education budget increases each year anyway, and a cursory comparison of the regular budget for education and the Title I program budget would not reveal this kind of irregularity.

A report by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund on Title I in the nation described several types of maintenance of effort violations in which Title I funds were used as general aid.[4] They include using Title I funds to equalize poor schools with other schools in the system, to subsume funding programs previously supported by state or local funds, and to replace and supplant other federal money.

New York City does not exhibit the more flagrant violations reported by the NAACP. Title I in New York City does tend to go to the poorer schools, as the law directs, and has been spent for the most part to improve the educational opportunities for children in these schools. During the first two years, however, some Title I money was used to provide needed office equipment and salaries for clerical and administrative personnel in the poorer schools; since then, New York City has been discontinuing these practices on its own. A more

[4] Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?

subtle type of abuse may be a practice that was apparent in the early nonvisible projects, where additional personnel services and supplies were provided to schools, without consideration of programmatic strategies. Reducing class size in those schools to that of schools in more advantaged areas without instituting an educational program would be in violation of the ESEA is the schools in the disadvantaged areas had a lower per-pupil expenditure to begin with; the Board seems to be aware of this and is attempting to discontinue these activities.

The concept of supplanting is complicated, especially when viewed in relationship to the provision about expanding ongoing programs. Supplanting means that Title I money is being used to support programs and services previously supported with local funds. There have been cases where some salaries of project staff were charged to Title I even when the incumbent occupied the position before the passage of the legislation; this is an abuse when the persons duties remain the same. There have been instances where Title I has paid the salary of a full-time person who actually devoted only part of his time to the Title I project; this may penalize the target child who may be entitled to these staff services under local funding. It is also a questionable practice to use Title I money for a project in target schools when the same program in nontarget schools is supported with local funds. This was the case with the More Effective Schools project. Prior to the ESEA, the ten More Effective Schools were financed from the City coffers; in 1965, with the availability of Title I funds, 11 schools were added to the project and all 21 were to be financed with Title I money. It was not until the 1966-67 school year that salaries for personnel in four of these schools, which were not eligible for Title I on the basis of the poverty criterion, were eliminated from Title I funding, although the schools did continue to receive some aid in the form of additional supplies and materials.

FUNDING AND BUDGETING

The prevalence of short-range year-by-year planning is contributed to by the Congressional appropriation of funds one year at a time -- which to date has been at a level considerably below the maximum entitlement -- by the late project approval by the SED, and by the annual evaluation cycle. As a result of these factors, Title I projects are planned and designed in an atmosphere of uncertainty. Although an LEA could plan its general program in the absence of information about the exact level of future funding, it becomes more difficult to recruit, hire, and train staff, and to make other specific plans.

Because the evaluation requirements cannot be completed until after the close of school in June, the LEA must do this planning and budgeting in the absence of detailed final information about the outcomes of the prior cycle projects. In order to meet the budgetary deadlines of the City, the Board of Education must design its total educational plans and set staffing goals for the whole system in the spring of each year. The plans for Title I should, accordingly, be finalized no later than the summer in order to implement projects in September. Although both the federal and City government's fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30, federal appropriations are usually late, often occurring after November; state approval of Title I projects is frequently even more delayed.[5]

Since there is no carry-over provision in Title I funding, what is not spent in the fiscal year is forever lost to the school district. To avoid this loss, projects -- especially those initiated late in the school year -- are frequently hurriedly assembled and put into operation. Longer-term funding with carry-over provisions would permit LEAs more flexibility in program design and would encourage more careful planning. This, of course, would necessitate changes in the law and in the Congressional funding cycle.

In New York City there is a great time lag before complete project expenditures are known; by the end of June 1968 final figures on expenditures were available for only the 1965-66 school year; by the beginning of 1970 expenditures for the 1967-68 year were not yet available. According to a HEW Audit Agency report, as of December 31, 1967 New York City had failed to report its expenditures and encumbrances for the 1966-67 school year (FY 1967).[6] Unfortunately, there has been no systematic investigation of the complete budgeting and accounting process, but there are some indications of probable factors contributing to the delay in reporting expenditures. Title I operates within the City school system, and the same problems plaguing the system affect Title I. For example, Title I teachers are paid at the same time and in the same manner as all other teachers; in fact, a Title I teacher is often distinguishable only on a payroll basis. In order to accurately monitor expenditures each pay period, separate payroll totals have to be tallied, and tallied by project. Computing these figures separately must certainly be an arduous task, but installation of modern identification systems and computerization of records would be a great help. Similar difficulties arise for records of materials, equipment, and instructional supplies. Separate records should be maintained for Title I, and on a continuous

---

[5] The Congressional authorization of Title I funds for the school year 1969-70 was made in April 1970.

[6] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Audit Agency, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Comptroller. Report on Audit of Selected Programs, Administered by the New York State Education Department, July 1, 1964-June 30, 1966. Audit Control No. 90038-02.

project-by-project basis. New York City has improved its record-keeping system in this respect over the three-year period.

But apart from these considerations, reimbursement from the federal government through the state is so delayed that there is no fiscal impetus for the local educational agencies to initiate faster and more costly record systems, since if an LEA does not receive payment for reimbursable expenses for several years there is no pressure on them to prepare final records. However, there are serious programmatic consequences of such delays, especially with regard to projects financed from accruals. Unexpended budgeted funds, or accruals, to the amount of the LEA's total allocation can and have been used to finance projects starting midway into the school year, as well as summer projects. Accruals were especially important for the summer 1968 since for that summer the LEAs no longer had the choice of charging the cost of summer projects to either fiscal year's budget but were required to add these charges to the previous year's budget. Since estimates of expenditures are so delayed, the maximum benefits of accruals cannot be realized. Programmatic decisions that are based on late and very rough estimates of available funds often make for delay in planning, with resulting difficulty in recruiting staff and children and in ordering supplies and materials. Many of the problems identified in the summer projects are directly attributable to the budgeting process.

According to the HEW Audit Agency report,[7] the SED has not established adequate fiscal procedures and controls in compliance with the federal Guidelines and regulations governing ESEA. The report suggests that the SED demonstrated a lack of effective fiscal supervision and review.

The HEW Audit Agency report notes that SED cash advances are unrelated to the LEA's cash needs, and suggests that New York City needs more frequent cash advances, computed on the basis of the total needs rather than on a project basis. A further suggestion is that the advances should be based on assessment of realistic cash requirements rather than on approved project budgets. Funds for salaries, for example, must be available on an immediate and regular basis. If the advances are inadequate, an LEA must borrow money and pay interest. If the advances are more than is needed, the money can be banked and interest collected. The Audit Agency reported that by December 31, 1967, New York City had a total of $141 million advanced for which it had made no accounting to the SED; on the other hand, the SED records did not show total fund balances on hand in LEAs.

---

[7] Ibid.

Recently much has been written about the need for the LEAs to recieve the maximum grant they are entitled to on the basis of the formula.[8] As we shall see below, New York City does not spend the whole of the prorated amount it receives. An increased appropriation, per se, may not result in improvements in project effectiveness. Needed are: longer-term funding with carry-over provisions; increased money for planning, for administration, and for evaluation; and a more concentrated per-child expenditure.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The disparity between what was proposed in the various project descriptions and what was actually implemented in the schools is reflected, in part, by the difference between proposed budgets and actual expenditures. Table IV-1 on the following page summarizes, by program area, the total amount of Title I funds budgeted and expended for 1965-66 and for 1966-67, and thus provides some measure of the extent of implementation. For the 1965-66 school year, 72 percent of the funds budgeted were expended; in the subsequent year, a considerably larger percentage of money was spent. The total amount budgeted deliberately exceeds the total allocation, although New York City can be reimbursed only to the amount of the allocation. In 1966-67, for example, New York City budgeted $75.4 million; its allocation for that year was $69.8 million. There was a total of $67.4 million expended.

What accounts for the disparity between budgets and expenditures? From an analysis by budget item, most of the unspent money was for salaries for instruction.[9] Generally, not enough personnel were available to staff the projects. The individual evaluation reports may refer to specific staff shortages, but generally do not indicate either the extent of the shortage or whether there was any improvement from a prior cycle. What is needed is an up-to-date, systematic assessment of the number of personnel available by area of professional skill -- a manpower planning study -- as a basis for planning future project activities. In the absence of sufficient numbers of personnel of one or another type of skill, alternate strategies or techniques for achieving an objective can be designed. This information appears essential for proper planning; it could be abstracted from payroll and financial records.

Staffing for Title I has been a recurrent problem, the specifics of which have changed with time. In the initial years the major difficulty

---

[8] For example, see Conclusions in NAACP, op. cit.

[9] Heller, op. cit., Chapter V.

TABLE IV-1

TITLE I FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED BY PROGRAM CONTENT AREA, 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

PROGRAM AREAS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES	SCHOOL YEAR 1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Early Childhood	9,275	80	8,599	104	18,217
Regular Academic	39,042	74	43,206	92	27,058
Motivational Academic	830	79	1,877	84	5,409
Supplementary Academic	7,603	62	9,576	89	2,394
Enrichment	352	36	121	53	118
Speech	379	45	645	65	210
Guidance	3,360	60	7,224	69	2,807
Special Needs	-	-	181	96	96
Teacher Training	6,091	68	1,820	78	453
Parents and Paraprofessionals	-	-	502	73	677
District Decentralized	-	-	1,496	74	16,197
Planning and Testing	-	-	129	58	63
TOTAL	$66,932	72%	$75,376	89%	$73,698

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.

was in securing enough classroom teachers to reduce class size and to staff the new projects. This problem was tackled by means of the Intensive Teacher Training Program, a Title I project designed to supply more teachers quickly. This project did increase the number of new teachers for 1966-67, and the staffing problems, especially in the non-public school projects, became much less acute.

The early projects also called for the use of many specialists to teach remedial reading, mathematics, speech, and enrichment activities. Especially in the large, nonvisible projects, additional specialists of many kinds were included in the proposals. Some evidence indicates that when school principals were advised of these additional positions they tended to assign one of their more experienced teachers to fill the opening. This practice contributed to the shortage of regular classroom teachers, and a large number of the regular positions were filled by substitute teachers. Citywide, from October 1964 to October 1967, there was a 53 percent increase in the number of substitute teachers in New York City, while for the same period the total pupil public school population increased by only approximately 6 percent.

A large number of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and guidance specialists were also included in the early project proposals; these personnel were and continue to be in very short supply. In the third year of Title I, alternate plans were adopted to make better use of these specialist services; for example, centers were established in convenient locations and some consultants were used. The Board now discourages the inclusion of such personnel in project plans, so that their scarcity will not affect the implementation of a project. If, however, there continues to be a great need for staff with particular skills or training, the Board may find it necessary to review its recruiting practices and licensing requirements in those specialties, or make other changes such as employing personnel on an hourly basis.

Supplies and materials are the other implementation problem that results in disparities between project budgets and expenditures. Year after year, in project after project, instructional materials and supplies failed to arrive on time for the start of the project; there were many instances where the materials were not delivered by the end of the project. It was not at all uncommon for the District Decentralized projects and for the summer programs to operate without any of the materials that had been ordered. In some cases, the staff of these projects borrowed materials from the host school, but more often than not solutions for this problem depended on the ingenuity of individuals and not on any established policy.

In part, the tardy receipt of supplies and materials depends on when project proposals are approved and the plans made known to the project coordinator, who only then can order the materials. Since final SED approval is so late, ordering materials is, in turn, delayed also. But it is well known that the late receipt of books and supplies is not confined to Title I-funded projects in New York City. Recently, the City Council conducted an investigation of the Board's failure to supply texts to schools in time for the opening of school; for this situation to be improved a full understanding of the causes of the bottlenecks must be sought.

Lack of space also hindered the carrying out of projects in the schools. For example, in the early years, many nonpublic schools participating in several Title I projects reported space problems that interfered with effective implementation of the projects; in one particular instance the problem was solved by rescheduling assignments. Scheduling can overcome some space problems but by no means all of them.

Up to this point, Table IV-1 and our discussion have dealt with quantitative aspects of implementation -- the number of personnel, dates of delivery of materials, and number of classrooms. There are more qualitative aspects of implementation that have infrequently been addressed. We have discussed some of these aspects in the preceding chapter, and have attempted to indicate the relationship between, for example, the experience of teachers and the relevancy of the materials to the outcomes that could be expected.

A completely detailed picture of the disparities between the proposed plans for a project and what actually occurred would mean a separate systematic investigation of the entire process of implementation. The early evaluations do not, in general, indicate whether a project was fully implemented, whether there was sufficient planning time, trained staff, and adequate materials, and whether the appropriate children were reached. Moreover, the evaluation studies pay little attention to the differences between schools participating in the same project. The meager evidence that is available indicates that implementation varies greatly among schools in the same project. The many elements -- the skill of a teacher, the children's readiness, the climate of the school, the sufficiency of supplies, the adequacy of the space -- all exhibit wide variations. Thus far, the evaluations have not focused on these factors and they have not tried to relate differences in implementation to differences among school outcomes. In the absence of detailed understanding of what went on in the schools, it is not possible to make definitive statements about any project's results.

COMMUNICATION AS AN IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEM

Project planning and dissemination of the project plans may be viewed as the first stages of project implementation. We have already noted many specific problems of communication, including the process by which projects are designed and initiated and the way schools and children are selected to participate.

Communication between project planners and the schools has been weak, and in some instances nonexistent. More often than not, principals in project schools have never seen a copy of the project description. In the first year of the Title I program, principals of schools participating in a project were often unaware of its existence. This was not particularly surprising in the case of the nonvisible projects such as Transitional Schools and Improved Services, where the project consisted soley of the assignment of additional personnel; nor was it surprising in the case of projects previously existing, such as Open Enrollment and More Effective Schools, where the change was simply in the source of funding. What is surprising is that in the second year of Title I there were still instances where principals were not aware that their school was participating, and did not know the name of the project although they knew they had extra slots for personnel; Transitional Schools was the most dramatic example. Some teachers in schools participating in the recycled project again reported that they knew nothing of the additional personnel, or of the program.

Even as recently as the 1968-69 school year, schools were designated as participants in projects where the principals had received no notification or explanation of the project, and were unable to describe its aims or the procedures to be followed to implement it.[10] There is very little inherent in the nature of many of these projects which distinguishes them as Title I projects; the shift that occurred in the Summer 1968 from Title I funds to funds from the New York State Urban Education Program illustrates the indistinguishable nature of many activities. On the other hand, in those projects that are readily identifiable the principals, the teaching staff, the paraprofessionals, and the parents of the children recognize that they are involved in a special project, although they may not all be able to identify the source of funds.

We do know that not all schools listed as participants in the project descriptions actually participate in the project; often the reason is a scarcity of personnel. Since the evaluations do not usually identify individual schools, we do not always know which schools did not participate. Moreover, we know very little about the different degrees of participation that can occur as a result of a shortage of

[10] Louise W. Fox. Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools. Center for Urban Education, October 1969.

one particular element of a project. To arrive at an assessment of the worth of a project we need to have some way of deciding, for example, whether a school should be considered a participant in a guidance project if it did not receive its full complement of guidance counselors. We need to know which children participated, how they were selected, and how they differ from children who did not participate.

In addition to the problems of communication between central Board headquarters and the schools, there are problems in the chain of communication that follows; for example, projects planned for public and nonpublic school children jointly did not receive enough publicity in the nonpublic schools, so that the number of nonpublic school children participating in these projects was less than the number proposed. Again and again in the summer programs, insufficient publicity between schools, and between schools and parents meant serious attendance problems. Other instances of incomplete and non-uniform communications abound; the consequences range from limiting the number of students who participate, to misconceptions about project goals by principals, and misunderstandings by parents and community groups.

There are certain procedural steps that if undertaken would guarantee more meaningful communication without necessitating changes in the funding cycle. To improve the communication process, it first seems important to identify the necessary steps in the process. Thus: who communicates program information from central headquarters? Do district superintendents receive descriptions of a project, including the objectives, the instructional strategies, and the list of participating schools? When and in what form is the information disseminated to them? Is the process systematic? Do the district superintendents take responsibility to transmit this information to school principals? How are principals notified, and when; what choices do they have? Is the detailed project information presented to the community action agencies? The same questions are applicable to the communication between principals and their staffs, principals and parents, and principals and the community.

New York City's educational system is large and complex. New York City receives funds for educational activities from many sources; often the laws governing the expenditures of funds overlap without being complementary. Title I operates within the larger pre-existing conventional structure; while this has advantages of nonduplication at upper levels of decision making and supervision, many disadvantages also accrue. In this chapter we have tried to indicate the need for a comprehensive, ongoing, and systematic collection of data describing the process and extent of project implementation. We have indicated possible areas of in-

vestigation of the process of communicating and disseminating program plans. We have raised questions concerning the recruitment of staff and have questioned fiscal policies. We have suggested studies that we believe should be made each year so as to permit more intelligent project planning and to provide a basis for judging the impact of a program on the children.

In the program area chapters that follow we will discuss in greater detail the more than one hundred individual Title I projects that operated between 1965-66 through the summer 1968. Each of the individual projects was classified in only one program area, and was so classified on the basis of our interpretation of the major aim of the project; almost without exception each project did list several goals and did employ a variety of strategies. For example, the College Discovery and Development project was classified and is discussed with the Motivational Academic projects -- projects whose aim is to improve the academic performance of students by improving their motivation for continued education -- although College Discovery and Development also emphasizes guidance services, remediation, tutoring, and other supplementary enrichment activities.

Within our program chapters projects are further subgrouped into components on the basis of certain features common to some of the projects and not to the others with the same overall aim. For example, within the Motivational Academic chapter, College Discovery and Development is discussed together with College Bound within one component, while Operation Return, Pregnant Girls, and the Street Academies are treated together as another component pertaining to out-of-school youth.

The underlying intention of such a classification scheme was twofold: we intended to lend organization to a collection of fairly disparate activities with the hope that this would help order future endeavors; we also intended that, by comparing projects of a similar nature, we would be able to identify project aspects or variables that relate to successful project outcomes.

The following nine chapters highlight many of the issues raised in the beginning and end of this report -- the issue of target children, the relation of objectives to pupil needs, and the problems involved in implementing and evaluating Title I projects. The data presented in Table IV-1 by program areas parallel the budgetary data presented for the projects in the program chapters that follow.

CHAPTER V

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

Early Childhood Title I projects seek to improve school readiness and academic functioning of children aged four to eight, spanning the preschool years through grade two. There are two components, Preschool and Early Grade programs. Table V-1 shows the amount budgeted and the percentage of Title I funds expended for the projects in each of the components.

In the third year of Title I, the budget for the Early Childhood programs more than doubled, and its percentage of the total funds budgeted rose from less than 10 to 25 percent, indicating the high priority placed on these activities by the Board of Education. These programs represent almost one-fourth of the total Title I monies budgeted in New York City in 1967-68. Early Childhood programs cover a wide range of activities. They are designed to serve as few as 2,300 and as many as 100,000 youngsters. They range in cost from $1.1 million to $9.7 million. They may serve as few as five schools or as many as almost all of the 275 Special Service schools. Title I funds paid for salaries of teachers, paraprofessionals, supervisory personnel, clinical support personnel (psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers), and speech therapists. Funds were also allocated for materials and supplies and for parent activities.

Within any one early childhood project there was wide diversity from school to school; implementation varied in the number of children served, in the deployment of staff, in the adequacy of facilities and materials, in the experience and effectiveness of teachers, and in the degree of parental involvement. Moreover, there was diversity in the individualization of instruction and in pupil readiness. Thus, it may be misleading to regard any one of these projects as a single entity.

PRESCHOOL COMPONENT

Reflecting the new national stress on the importance of education for the very young child, preschool projects early became an important focus of activity in New York City, and this emphasis increased over the years. A major innovation made possible by Title I funds was the offering of preschool experiences to four-year-olds. The preschool projects intended to give children from poor families the educational advantages and experiences other children receive in private nursery schools. In 1965-66, Title I funds were allocated to Prekindergarten projects (called Head Start in the summer) and to an Expanded Kindergarten project. Thereafter, Prekindergarten and Head Start projects have been recycled, but the Expanded Kindergarten

TABLE V-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS, 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENT AND PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
PRESCHOOL TOTAL	7,798	81	8,599	104	7,449
Prekindergarten	3,522	83	4,476	107	3,458
Headstart	4,276	80	4,123	100	3,992
Expanded K	1,477	70	-	-	-
EARLY GRADES TOTAL	-	-	-	-	10,767
Strengthened Early Childhood	-	-	-	-	9,690
5 Primary Schools	-	-	-	-	1,078
TOTAL EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM	$9,275	80%	$8,599	104%	$18,217

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.

project has not been refunded as a discrete Title 1 project.[1]

The Prekindergarten Title I project was an effort to prepare children for school one year earlier than the usual age, or in the instance of Head Start, one summer earlier.[2] The Expanded Kindergarten project sought to enhance learning opportunities through enriched curriculum and the introduction of more adults in the classroom.

The evaluators of the preschool projects uniformly expressed the conviction that the opening of public schools in poverty areas to four-year-olds was necessary and beneficial, and reported that it was so perceived and welcomed by school personnel, parents, and children.

The number of preschool-age children in New York far exceeds available facilities. Few evaluators posed the question of whether the appropriate population was reached by the Title I preschool projects. Those who dealt with this issue at all held differing opinions on the adequacy of admission criteria and the measures used to reach the most disadvantaged. Since attendance in the projects is voluntary, probably the more motivated parents enrolled their children; no systematic procedures were used to recruit other, harder to reach children. In the first summer of Title I Head Start, many children were re-registrants, having had some prior school experience. Title I Head Start centers and Office of Economic Opportunity Head Start centers competed for youngsters, and some neighborhoods were saturated with facilities. In the third cycle of Prekindergarten evaluators still criticized the admission criteria as too flexible and vague.

The age of preschool children presented other difficulties. The teachers lacked adequate knowledge about the interests and abilities of four- and five-year-old children in general and of disadvantaged ones in particular, although literature on the subject exists. Teacher retraining was not a stated project objective; in general, the preschool project teachers did not provide the activity level and learning atmosphere of the best private nursery schools, which emphasize cognitive skills, social

---

[1] In 1966-67, there was a small Kindergarten project in Two Districts in Brooklyn; the project consisted of assigning paraprofessionals as aides to 144 kindergarten teachers. The Strengthened Early Childhood project also had a kindergarten aide aspect to it. In 1968-69, several schools participated in a U.S. Office of Education-sponsored program of kindergarten "Follow Through", which was partially funded by Title I. The program encourages innovative efforts with the aim of developing the most effective kindergarten program models.

[2] Title I Head Start in this City was geared to five-and six-year-olds with no previous school experience. Nationally, under the Office of Economic Opportunity program, Head Start was supposed to be restricted to four-year-old children.

experience, development of sensory-motor skills, a structured and progressive range of experience, self-knowledge, individuality, and independence.

Observers of the first-year program saw a lack of communication and interaction among children or between children and teachers. Children rarely selected their own activities. In general, the language program was not considered effective, little science was taught, and little instruction in arithmetic took place.

The project was not very different from conventional kindergarten where the emphasis is on preparing children for the discipline required in school, rather than on emphasizing socialization and learning about the world through play. The atmosphere in the 1966 summer Head Start project was more relaxed than that observed in the regular school year, although teachers were not eliciting independent thinking and reasoning from the children.

The weakest aspects of the program were the instructional program and teaching methods -- what and how children were being taught. Some changes took place in the second cycle. The projects were geared somewhat more to making up the assumed deficiencies in the educationally deprived child's background (the compensatory emphasis). Evaluators, however, decried the lack of knowledge and awareness teachers showed of the needs of all four-year-olds, and particularly black and Puerto Rican youngsters. Teachers did not present the children with an orderly and sequential learning experience. They did not develop in the children the ability to think and reason for themselves. They did not involve the children sufficiently in materials, or in story telling and discussion. They did not capitalize on individual differences and did not attend to the special needs of non-English-speaking children.

In the third year, the Prekindergarten and Head Start projects were still considered a watered-down kindergarten experience where children did not have enough opportunity for informal learning. Children did appear more independent, were more verbal, and had longer attention spans -- benefits which may have resulted from greater teacher experience. Teachers were seen as more supportive and less authoritarian than in the prior years.

In general, there were enough teachers, although clinical support positions were frequently unfilled. Materials, with the exception of books, records, and science materials, were found to be appropriate, abundant, of good quality, but often arrived late. (In the Head Start projects, as in other summer projects, materials were delivered very late.) Outdoor play space and equipment for gross motor development were insufficient. Very often the available resources were not used to best advantage.

The most urgent recommendation, recurring in all evaluation reports, is for intensive orientation and training of teachers. Teachers need to understand the growth and dynamics of preschoolers. They need direction in appropriate curriculum content, teaching techniques, and classroom management. Both teachers and paraprofessionals have to learn how to work together effectively, and new roles for both have to be established. The paraprofessional also needs training in child development theory. In the light of the large numbers of children speaking only Spanish, whose needs are not being met, more bilingual paraprofessionals should be engaged. Teachers themselves would benefit from Spanish-language instruction.

Evaluation of preschoolers' performance is difficult. Group testing of young children is impossible; individualized tests are costly and their predictive value for later scholastic success in uncertain. Observations are not well enough developed or refined to assess changes in individual children. A good program for preschoolers is expensive to implement, because of the necessity of small groups, the variety of materials, and the additional classroom space. Thus it is necessary to seek alternative indicators of the effectiveness of a project in modifying the children's behavior, attitudes, or performance.

There is a dearth of longitudinal studies of New York City children with preschool experience, so we are left with little knowledge of the durability of any intellectual and social gains which may result from pre-kindergarten. Followup studies in New York City are difficult to conduct because of the high rate of pupil mobility and the problems of tracing particular children. As we have noted previously, project staff keep records infrequently and inconsistently. In the one instance where a pupil identification number was introduced (by the Office of Economic Opportunity, not by the Board of Education), it was never used again, and its potential value was lost.

Even for children who go on to public kindergarten or first grade, it is often impossible to identify those with preschooling. Other children go on to first grade in the nonpublic schools, and are also difficult to trace. Moreover, some of the youngsters participating in kindergarten projects may become our first school dropouts largely because of the scarcity of kindergarten seats. The Expanded Kindergarten project, Title I 1965-66, was an attempt to respond to the need for additional facilities; 72 additional classes were projected to accomodate more than 3,000 children. Late afternoon classes were also established, but were very poorly attended because of the hour.

Until the preschool concept is well integrated into the schools and built into the curriculum, the full potential of preschool experience may

not be realized.[3] Many other people need to become more involved to accomplish this integration. The efforts of supervisors would be more useful if their load was reduced. Efforts to involve parents must be increased beyond providing space for typing and sewing activities; workshop sessions could be introduced experimentally in which parents learn how to build on, at home, the child's school experience. Principals need to understand the goals of preschooling so as to integrate it with the total school program and to provide teachers with the necessary support.

The total curriculum for prekindergarten and kindergarten needs revision and modification. It should have an enriched content combining elements of both the learning-through-play approach and specific skills development, a compensatory approach. These two approaches can be centered on the child both as a four-year-old and as educationally deprived.

EARLY GRADE COMPONENT

In 1967, the Strengthened Early Childhood project was introduced in 240 public schools, nearly all of the total schools eligible for Title I assistance; this project accounted for more than half of all Title I money budgeted for Early Childhood programs. It was designed to follow through on the relative richness of the prekindergarten experience, and thereby improve education in kindergarten, first, and second grade classes.[4] The principal techniques employed in the Strengthened Early Childhood project was the lowering of the teacher-child ratio in grade 1 and 2 classes; in kindergarten classrooms paraprofessionals were assigned.

The provision of extra teachers to achieve a 1:15 ratio in grade 1 and 1:20 in grade 2 did not invariably have the intended result. The result, generally, was the establishment of either single classes with reduced registers, or of paired classes of up to 40 children and two teachers present in one classroom designed for 30 pupils. Overall, even in single classes class size was not decreased appreciably.

Moreover, these administrative rearrangements had little positive effect on the learning environment. The dominant instructional pattern in single classes was total group instruction of a lecture-discussion type. In most paired classes, the usual form of instruction was that one teacher

---

[3] A followup study of 179 children with six weeks' experience in the Summer 1965 Head Start project noted that while they experienced less difficulty in initial adjustment to kindergarten," . . . there was no significant difference between the scores of Head Start children and their classmates in kindergarten who did not have Head Start, as measured by the Pre-school Inventory six to eight months after the summer Head Start experience." Max Wolff and Annie Stein, Six Months Later, Yeshiva University, 1967, (mimeo).

[4] One aspect, to improve diagnosis of reading difficulties, involved utilization of special Board of Education facilities or hospital and university clinics. Personnel and parents reported improvement. However, the capacity of these facilities was much too limited to reach all needy children.

conducted a lesson for the entire class while the other teacher assisted, helped children to follow instructions, or maintained discipline. Teachers working together in one classroom reported differences in personality and in teaching styles. Most teachers indicated that they would prefer working with a paraprofessional.

In the kindergarten where paraprofessionals were assigned to individual classrooms, the teachers performed fewer monitorial and household tasks, but this freed time did not lead to more imaginative work with children. There was no evidence of increased experimentation and innovation in curriculum content. The frequency of small-group instruction quadrupled, but many teachers continued to instruct large groups.[5]

In grades 1 and 2, the choice of instructional methods and classroom organization was left to teachers; they were urged to be flexible in classroom organization, with groupings based on the children's ability and needs. In general, little change in teaching methods or organization was evident. Nor were there changes or innovations in curriculum. The basal reader-workbook approach predominated. Arithmentic instruction was essentially drill, and the unit approach in social studies and science was not used. There was not enough variety in the enrichment materials, and teachers demonstrated materials instead of letting the children use them. Moreover, the instructional materials were not relevant to the children's background. As in the Preschool programs, the special needs of non-English-speaking children were not attended to. The evaluator concluded that "Instruction lacks a creative dimension . . . [The children] sorely need instructional activities and expansion of the curriculum."[6]

Other program elements were not well implemented either. Increased parental involvement, although it had been a goal of the Strengthened Early Childhood project, was not widely achieved.[7] Eight dollars per child was allotted for additional materials including paperback books for the children to take home. The materials were late in arriving, and by the end of the year 20 percent of the children had not received them.

---

[5] Inez Smith, et al. An Evaluation of a Program for the Recruitment, Training, and Employment of Auxiliary Non-Professional Neighborhood Personnel for Careers in the New York City Schools, Center for Field Research and School Services, School of Education, New York University, December 1968.

[6] Sydney L. Schwartz, A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools: The Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades 1 and 2 and the Provision of Additional Materials, Center for Urban Education, November 1968.

[7] See chapter on Community Participation in Title I for a more complete discussion of this aspect of the project.

The administrative technique of reduced teacher-pupil ratios may be self-defeating, unless some effort is made to institute substantive curriculum changes. There was no indication that the needs of the children were being met; this was emphasized even more in the project's recycling.[8] In a program designed to strengthen early childhood education, the teachers need to be well trained and the role of supervisors and paraprofessionals should be expanded and spelled out.

The Special Primary Program (Five Schools project), was introduced in 1967-68 in five Strengthened Early Childhood schools. This project was intended as an addition to the Strengthened Early Childhood project, and was aimed chiefly at raising the children's achievement level and involving parents in children's reading experiences.

Five Schools was intended as a more fully developed program than Strengthened Early Childhood, covering all primary grades but concentrating on kindergarten through second. Again, procedures included more personnel to reduce class size and to provide auxiliary clinical services. Because of implementation problems it was not particularly effective. The five schools varied greatly in how they deployed the staff. There was a shortage of clinical personnel. The afterschool centers, a feature of the proposal, were attended by less than one-fourth of the children. Except for one school's parent steering committee, no adequate method was developed to involve parents as participants in their children's learning process. The investigators found no significantly better achievement than in the comparison groups.

Since this project was layered on top of the Strengthened Early Childhood project operating in the five schools, implementation problems increased and outcomes were confounded. This was even more evident in the 1968-69 Five Schools project, where the services of the Strengthened Early Childhood project in these schools were curtailed.[9]

In conclusion, while early childhood programs have received a substantial amount of the total Title I funds in New York City, the results in terms of meeting the needs of the children have not justified the expenditure, although it may be unfair to judge a project after only one or two years of operation. Board of Education preschool projects have not fulfilled the promise of Head Start, which captured the nation's imagination. Attempts to provide followthrough on the preschool experience have been poorly realized. Clearly, as the projects have been structured, additional classrooms are needed to improve educational opportunities in the early childhood grades. At present, ESEA restricts the use of Title I funds for construction to minor remodeling, and new classrooms may have to await

[8]Cynthia Almeida, A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools, Center for Urban Education, October 1969.

[9]Nathan Kravetz and Edna M. Phillips, Special Primary Program in Five Schools, Center for Urban Education, October 1969.

new sources of money for construction.

If current thinking on the importance of reaching young children prevails, fundamental restructuring of the entire early childhood area is required. New curricula are needed, based on the most recent theories of child development. New attempts are needed to identify teachers who have the special sensitivity needed for reaching young children. And new ways must be developed to actively engage parents in home support and followthrough of the skills children learn in school.

CHAPTER VI

REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Farrell L. McClane

Title I projects defined here as Regular Academic include those in which the class participates as a unit during regular school hours, even though the class may be divided for some particular subjects or instruction. All were for public school children and took place during the regular school year. The primary goal of the Regular Academic programs was to raise the academic achievement of students residing in economically depressed areas.

The eight projects classified as Regular Academic were subdivided into the following three components; Integration, Compensatory Education, and Innovative and Experimental projects. Regular Academic programs were the most heavily funded of all Title I program areas. Table VI-I on the following page presents the amount budgeted and the percentage of funds expended each year for each project. The early emphasis on Integration projects was superseded by the Compensatory Education projects; the latter projects' budgets almost doubled during the three years.

INTEGRATION COMPONENT

Integration was one of the major concerns in 1965-66, and almost all of the more than 30 Title I projects funded that year included some general hope that integration would be achieved. Implicit in the belief that integrated education denoted quality education, several projects specifically designed to achieve integration were proposed and implemented. These projects -- Transitional Schools, Open Enrollment, Middle Schools, and Comprehensive High Schools -- used distinctively different approaches to achieve integration within the City's schools: additional services, transfer programs, and grade reorganization approaches, respectively.

The Special Enrichment Program for Transitional Schools, unlike other projects seeking to achieve integration, was created to halt the exodus of white middle-class families from neighborhoods characterized by a growing population of low-income families, mainly black and Puerto Rican. The project planners anticipated that emigration from these neighborhoods in transition would slow, or cease, if the quality of education in the local elementary and junior high schools was raised. There was, however, no indication that the project did in fact stem the exodus of the white middle class.

Improved education was to be realized through concentrated reading remediation, special enrichment classes, lower class size, and after-school tutorial centers. More teachers and specialists, assistants-to-principals, and school secretaries were added to the selected schools. The additional

TABLE VI-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
1956-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENT AND PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
INTEGRATION	23,413	75	27,596	94	3,475
Transitional	6,665	68	7,841	94	-
Open Enrollment	4,292	73	5,964	93	3,475
Comprehensive High School	8,369	85	8,926	99	-
Middle Schools	4,087	69	4,865	85	-
COMPENSATORY	7,697	67	9,092	87	14,963
Improved Services	7,697	67	9,092	87	-
Compensatory Education	-	-	-	-	14,963
INNOVATIVE	7,932	77	6,518	92	8,620
MES	7,932	77	6,518	92	8,537
P129	-	-	-	-	83
TOTAL	$39,042	74%	$43,206	92%	$27,058

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.

positions were allocated to the schools without consulting with principals. It was not uncommon for a principal to assign the new personnel to fill areas that had been understaffed and to expand ongoing school programs rather than to initiate new ones. Since some principals were not aware that their schools were participating in a project, they made no effort to develop new special activities. The services were nonvisible, that is, they interlocked with and were indistinguishable from the ongoing educational programs in the participating schools. School personnel were generally enthusiastic about the Transitional Schools project, although its goals were not achieved. Despite some success in reducing class size and in providing additional personnel, standardized test results showed no improvement in reading and arithmetic.

Except for Transitional Schools, the Integration projects were traditional transfer programs where children from overcrowded schools in disadvantaged areas were transferred to less crowded schools in other, predominantly white, neighborhoods. In most instances the transfers resulted in more ethnically balanced school population in the receiving school, but all too often it meant overcrowded facilities, double and sometimes triple sessions, and homogeneous groupings for the transferred students.

The earliest transfer program, Open Enrollment (formerly known as the Free-Choice Transfer Program), began in 1960. Pupil participation in this project was initially voluntary and the project was financed entirely with tax levy funds. Under the Board's original plan, students from overcrowded segregated schools were permitted, upon parental request, to seek transfers to selected, less crowded schools that offered the opportunity for an integrated educational experience.

Starting with the 1965-66 school year, Title I funded additional positions in the Open Enrollment receiving schools, based on the child benefit theory--children electing to attend non-Title I-eligible schools should not be deprived of services to which they would have been entitled had they remained in their neighborhood school. Open Enrollment was intended to improve academic functioning in the receiving schools through reduced class size, subject specialists, intensive classroom and after-school instruction, remediation, counseling, homework assistance, and employment of enrichment materials and newer media to facilitate learning. Integration and improved pupil functioning continued to be the program's major emphasis until the 1968-1969 school year, when the policy of transfer-by-request was exchanged for transfer-by-mandate; in overcrowded and overutilized schools, mandatory student transfers permitted students to attend less crowded or underutilized facilities. Integration thus became a goal secondary to improved utilization of schools.

The effectiveness of Open Enrollment is difficult to measure. A crucial dimension of the project -- integration -- was not assessed because no provision was made for it in the evaluation design. As a result there is little indication of what proportion of the eligible students actually took advantage of the opportunity to transfer. However, some information is available from the evaluation reports which indicate that not all eligible children took advantage of Open Enrollment. Some parents rejected the transfer concept because they wanted

their children educated within their immediate community; others were reluctant because of the inconvenience of transportation and the hardship that would be inflicted on children, especially the younger ones; and because of inadequate publicity, many parents had not heard of the program.

In the receiving schools, two-thirds of the teachers involved in Open Enrollment felt that the project improved understanding and relationships among children of different racial groups, while promoting and developing professional growth among teachers. Staff who felt negatively about the project most often complained that their teaching tasks had become more difficult because additional students increased the number of disciplinary problems, and because they felt the need to alter their teaching methods. A few teachers felt the quality of instruction in the receiving schools had declined. This, however, was not substantiated in any of the findings. The evaluators reported that resident students did not suffer in any manner, academically or socially.

On the other hand, the academic performance of transferred students did not dramatically improve, and in many instances it actually declined. Except for progress made in classroom participation and verbal fluency, the Open Enrollment students' gains were disappointing. Despite efforts to improve their academic performance, the transfer students continued to progress at about the same rate as they had previously, gaining about 6 months in reading during the same period that resident students gained 7 months. Long-term gains were measurable in this project because the evaluator was the same in all three years; these gains were not impressive and reading level seemed not to be affected by the number of years spent in the project. Part of the difficulty may lie in the fact that the additional services assigned to the Open Enrollment receiving schools were not necessarily devoted exclusively to the transfer pupils, but were shared with the resident children. The extent of help received by the Open Enrollment pupils cannot be determined from the information that is available.

The Middle Schools and the Four Year Comprehensive High Schools projects were created in accordance with New York State Education Commissioner Allen's desegregation proposal of 1964; in order to achieve racial balance, the Board of Education was to reorganize all levels of New York City public schools, replacing the 6-3-3 school organization with the 4-4-4 plan.

In the Middle Schools project, ninth-grade students were transferred to high schools, while sixth-grade students (transferred from elementary schools -- see Improved Services) were added to the middle school registers. The middle schools were to be located in areas that served a cross-section of the population. It was believed that by changing the feeder elementary school patterns for each newly organized middle school, a better ethnic balance would result in the middle school. To improve the performance of Middle Schools students, a new and unique curriculum was introduced. It included a course in urban living -- the preparation of students for adult responsibility in city living, foreign language, typewriting, and instrumental music for all students entering the sixth grades of the pilot schools. The proposal stressed team teaching, programmed instruction, and individualized learning activities. Teachers

were generally enthusiastic about typewriting and foreign language for program entrants, although they received urban living, the most innovative aspect of the curriculum, reluctantly. Some questioned the advisability of offering such a course, since they were uncertain about the role the schools should play in coping with urban problems. Despite the project's curricular innovations, there were no discernible gains in pupil achievement.

Moreover, the evaluation of the Middle Schools project indicated that, for the most part, the new organizational structure reinforced rather than diminished segregation at the middle school level; students from 19 of the 48 feeder elementary schools were placed in a much more segregated school setting than they would have attended without the reorganization; students from 8 schools were in a slightly more segregated setting; students from 6 schools were in a less segregated setting, and for students from 15 schools there was no change between the feeder and the intermediate school. In addition, the assignment of students to classes according to reading ability resulted in homogeneous groupings. Desegregation efforts were further weakened by the lack of specific plans and activities designed to facilitate social and educational interaction of pupils.

The Four Year Comprehensive High School project was the other phase of the grade reorganization plan. Academic and vocational high schools were to be converted into four-year comprehensive high schools. Ninth-year students, from areas where overcrowding and de facto segregation existed in elementary and junior high schools, were to be assigned to the Comprehensive High Schools. The ninth and tenth years were to be used as an exploratory period and students would not have tomake a course commitment until their eleventh year. In addition to the goal of achieving integration, the Comprehensive High Schools project sought to reduce the number of high school dropouts through provision of remedial reading specialists, special guidance services, behavior counselors, and additional teachers to reduce class size.

In a limited way the Comprehensive High Schools project can be considered successful, for more minority students entered academic high schools than previously. There was improvement in the overall ethnic balance in the high schools especially in the academic ones; of the 3 academic high schools studied, no school had less than 15 percent nor more than 50 percent minority students. But within the schools, little was done to improve integration; the typical black or Puerto Rican student was enrolled in segregated remedial classes and general track courses. The addition of ninth graders increased the high schools' total registration and caused serious overcrowding in some schools. Reduced class size further commplicated the situation by increasing the number of classrooms needed and adding to severe teacher shortages.

To relieve congestion, the school day was lengthened to double and triple sessions. Transferred ninth graders were required to attend the afternoon sessions and were thereby excluded from participation in the after-school centers and other extra-curricular activities. Thus opportunities for spontaneous integration among the students were further limited.

While transferred ninth-grade students gained 9 months in reading comprehension, students remaning in the regular junior high schools improved by 11 months during the same time period. The project was not as successful in reaching its other goals for student truancy, and mobility generally increased and the dropout rate did not change. Staff reaction to the Comprehensive High Schools project varied widely. Many teachers reserved judgment about the program, while several others felt it was stimulating and motivating. Some felt that the schools were not properly prepared to implement the project, and the remaining teachers felt the plan was being executed too quickly.

In summary, these Integration projects generally had a positive effect on teacher morale: class size was reduced, making teaching tasks less onerous; additional subject specialists, classroom teachers, and nonteaching personnel -- a major focus of new programs -- relieved teachers of many nonteaching responsibilities and allowed them more free time. Nonetheless, there were not corresponding benefits for the children. Planned undertakings such as Middle Schools and Comprehensive High Schools have contributed little to the academic growth of the deprived children from whom they were designed.

All in all, the Integration projects undertaken with Title I funds have not met with success in the New York City schools. These projects have attempted to achieve integration by emphasizing structual and organizational changes, and have paid too little attention to substantive issues. The administrative techniques, which have proved difficult to implement, have repeatedly taken the place of new or creative programming. Relatively little effort has gone into making certain that, in those instances where schools have been integrated, meaningful integration within classrooms takes place. It is obvious that too often projects were introduced without the essential preparation that would maximize success. Especially in projects designed to promote integration, failure is unavoidable without fundamental planning. With projects such as Open Enrollment, whose success depends on public acceptance, more effort should have been exerted to acquaint parents and teachers with the character and objectives of the program. We must question the propriety of continued use of Title I funds on projects that have not experienced positive results.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM COMPONENT

The Compensatory Education component consists of two projects, Improved Services and Compensatory Education. The former began in 1965-66 and was recycled in 1966-67. The Compensatory Education project was initiated in the third year of Title I.

Improved Services was designed to improve the quality of education in 207 Special Service elementary schools and 24 junior high schools. Additional personnel and services were provided to improve students' academic achievement and to increase their motivation. The transfer of sixth-grade children to the Middle Schools project resulted in overall improvement in conditions in the truncated elementary schools; there was room for prekindergarten classes, double sessions were reduced or totally eliminated, and class registers were lowered to allow for experimentation with programmed instruction and new educational materials.

The project proposal called for the use of a large number of specialists, and the project schools experienced serious difficulties in filling these positions. During the first year there were many instances where the schools used Other Teaching Personnel (OTPs), experienced expert teachers specializing in a particular subject area, to fill the additional Improved Services positions. Because these experienced teachers were needed in the classroom, the Board of Education devised the cluster position, which by directive became an integral part of the project. Cluster teachers were to be assigned to classrooms for the express purpose of reinforcing students' "fundamental skills." They were to have at least one year's experience, but many did not.

Results of the cluster program varied. A majority of the schools provided no training. Cluster teachers performed a multitude of teaching and nonteaching functions, taking over classes at assigned times, and providing small group remediation at other times. In some schools, OTPs were substituted for cluster teachers when principals felt the latter group was too inexperienced. Observers found that, with few exceptions, the cluster program did not result in creative learning situations, although the majority of the principals assessed this aspect positively. The cluster teachers themselves were divided as to the worth of the experience.

The primary strategy used in the Improved Services project was the allocation of additional positions. In one way or another most of the positions were filled, and the added staff freed regular teachers for preparation periods, as called for in the contract with the United Federation of Teachers. Principals stated that having these additional personnel encouraged innovation in programs and curriculum; they reported that more diagnostic and remedial work was being done in reading and that experimental enrichment programs in music and art were introduced. They also reported that auxiliary teachers acted as interpreters for non-English-speaking students, and lessened the gap between the home and the school by making home visits and conducting parent conferences and workshops. Principals believed, and teachers concurred, that the addition of specialists bolstered

the classroom teacher in areas where some classroom teachers did not excel, and that guidance, behavioral, and health problems of students were more likely to be recognized earlier, and attended to. Since the additional personnel gave teachers more time for preparation periods, and required them to spend less time on disciplinary problems, teacher morale was raised impressively.

Notwithstanding these acknowledged benefits, the evaluators found that there was an acute need for better qualified and more experienced teachers. The additional guidance counselors enabled the classrooms to operate with fewer disruptions, but because of the scarcity of counselors only those children with serious problems were seen. Inadequate numbers of counselors restricted the development of vocational, educational, and preventive guidance services. In the first year there were no meaningful changes in pupils' reading achievement, but by the second year of the project three grades made some gains in reading, although the children continued to perform below grade level.

The assignment of additional personnel, per se, does not enhance innovative programming. Teacher training, experience, and supervision are crucial. The evaluators felt that the Improved Services project might have been more effective had the cluster teachers received special training and supervision and had the principals of the participating schools been involved in the planning stages of the project development.

In an attempt to strengthen these activities and to combine the services of related projects, the Compensatory Education project was initiated in 1967-68. This project represented the Board's attempt to use Title I funds in ways that were visible and distinct. Compensatory Education replaced the Improved Services and Transitional Schools project, and incorporated some elements from the Open Enrollment, Middle Schools, Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, and Child Caring Institutions projects. According to the new plan for Compensatory Education, personnel assignments would be made in specific subject areas where the schools indicated need. The results, however, were not encouraging. Although more than 90 percent of the allocated positions were filled, the participating principals still felt that they were not consulted; they were not asked to suggest the particular kinds of personnel they needed to make a viable program.

The anticipated improvement in reading did not materialize. The guidance program was also disappointing, continuing to suffer from an inadequate number of qualified counselors. An inordinate amount of counseling time was devoted to crises and problems, rather than to preventive, educational, and vocational considerations. In general, teachers benefited by the additional personnel allocated for the program, but educational gains for students were minimal.

This project was not a significant improvement over the Improved Services project. Neither project's outcomes warrant continued funding, especially

under Title I which could be used to better purpose.

INNOVATIVE AND EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM COMPONENT

The More Effective Schools (MES) project and Academic Excellence in an Inner-City Elementary School (P129) are two experimental and innovative public school programs that have been supported primarily under Title I. More Effective Schools, recycled continuously, was initiated in 1964 in 10 schools. In 1965-66, 11 new schools were added. Of the 21 More Effective Schools in 1967-68, only 17 qualified for staff under ESEA eligibility. On an average, $500,000 was budgeted per school. The P129 project, on the other hand, was cycled for only one year, 1967-68, and operated in one school located in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, with less than $83,000. More Effective Schools and P129 were unusual in that the projects' plans, development, and implementation did not emanate solely from Board of Education efforts. More Effective Schools resulted from the cooperative planning and joint endeavor of the Council of Supervisory Associations, United Federation of Teachers, and representatives of the Superintendent of Schools. Consultations were also held with parent, professional, and civil rights groups, as well as with schools' staff. P129 was organized and directed by Project Beacon of Yeshiva University, through a Ford Foundation grant. From its inception, the project enlisted the aid of the District Superintendent and his staff, the parents, the local school board, and the local community action agency -- Youth In Action.

Both projects were designed to improve academic achievement for educationally deprived children: More Effective Schools was a comprehensive project involving public school children from prekindergarten through grade 6, and was a full-time undertaking. The purpose of MES was to counteract academic failure among younger students and to assist older students to overcome any previous educational deficiency. The main procedures used for attaining these goals included reduced class size, increased professional staff, and expanded guidance services.

Academic Excellence in an Inner-City Elementary School, P129, sought to saturate PS 129K with additional services. According to the project proposal, it was hoped that a model elementary school would be developed through innovative educational techniques. The project attempted to raise the academic level of students who were reading considerably below grade expectation, to improve the quality of instruction, and to rehabilitate dropouts. Five separate project elements were established to achieve the stated goals: (1) The Decentralized element which instituted a Governing Board made up of school and community representatives.[1] (2) The Learning

---

[1]This aspect of the P129 project will be discussed at length in the chapter on Community Participation in Title I.

Center, created to work with severe reading retardates who have not responded to regular school programs. The concept of contingency management, an "earn while you learn" notion, was to be an important aspect of the Learning Center. Under this plan children accumulate points for performance and behavior, which are later exchanged for more tangible rewards such as games, watches, transistor radios, jewelry, etc. The underlying premise was that the children experiencing immediate material rewards would eventually come to appreciate the more intangible rewards of learning. (3) The Saturation project element, which emphasized small class size, individualized and small instruction, and special talent groupings; it also utilized community people for liaison between the school and the home. (4) Inservice Training, was directed to training teachers in new methods of instruction, in the design of new curricula, and in working with paraprofessionals. (5) The Science project aspect, which emphasized discovery and critical thinking methods, and used special materials was designed to stimulate individual scientific investigation by students.

The United Federation of Teachers sanctioned the More Effective Schools program and the teachers received it with vigorous approval. The community, parents, and students were enthusiastic about it. More Effective Schools was generally well implemented, although the degree of implementation varied from school to school. There was an abundance of classes for four-year-olds, but a lack of classes for three-year-olds; all schools used team teaching, although only one used the nongraded block method; the program had adequate personnel to cope with pupils' emotional and social problems, but not enough medical personnel to deal with their physical problems.

Teachers and principals indicated that academic growth was evident among the students, and that it was a direct result of More Effective Schools. In addition, they agreed that pupils' attitudes toward learning had improved, and that they had more positive attitudes toward school. Teacher morale improved with the smaller classes, the free time for daily preparation periods, and the addition of teaching specialists and cluster teachers. School personnel felt that the relationship between school and community had improved with the addition of a full-time community relations position in each More Effective Schools school. The children themselves felt that what they were learning was useful, that their teachers were interested in them and wanted to help them.

However, a study of the annual More Effective Schools evaluations disclosed that the early optimism enjoyed during the first year of the project was not fully justified in the later years of the project's operation. Review of More Effective Schools students' past academic performance revealed that students were retarded in reading at the experiment's beginning, achieving at the average rate of approximately 6 months during 8 months of instructional time. After a year's participation, third-grade students gained 8 months in reading; children in grades 4 and 5 gained 11 months; sixth-grade students gained 12 months; only second graders continued to gain at the same rate of 6 months. Thus, as encouraging as this initial reading growth appeared to be, continued annual study revealed that the initial

positive effects of the More Effective Schools project on reading were not sustained. In October 1966, the median reading score for second graders was 1.8, about 3 months below grade expectation. Median scores for grades 4 and 6 did increase somewhat, but third-and fifth grade classes were reading at 2.4 and 3.7, respectively, indicating a decline in their previous growth rate. By April 1967, there was a decline in rate of growth for all grades, but most pronounced in the fifth and sixth grades.

Further data analysis showed that reading progress was not consistent nor durable between the spring and fall testing periods. Greatest gains were shown in the spring with a significant decline by the following fall. The evaluators suggested that this cyclical decline and advance might indicate that teachers and children alike directed their energies to success in the spring testing as a natural conclusion of their work year, while they experienced no such impetus for the fall testing.

Observers found that the lessons offered in the More Effective Schools schools were above average in both quality and the amount of material covered, when compared with lessons observed in the control schools. However, they saw little adaption of lessons or innovative lesson planning as a result of small class size, and concluded that lessons given in More Effective Schools classes could be taught in larger classes with no loss in effectiveness.

Teaching personnel as well as evaluators agreed that the most pressing problem of the More Effective Schools project was staff selection. A sufficient number of experienced teachers, adequately prepared to function competently in the innovative capacity demanded by the project, did not volunteer. Some More Effective Schools teachers had objections to heterogenous grouping, a key aspect of the project, and many others misunderstood the concept and purpose of heterogeneous grouping. It is understandable that the most frequently mentioned recommendation from the individual evaluations is for rigorous teacher preparation especially tailored to the More Effective Schools project.

A review of P129's five program aspects reveals that despite the innovative strategies, this project was the least successful of all programs discussed in this chapter. The project was beset with conflict and problems of staffing and implementation.

The Learning Center was intended to serve a total of 100 pupils in four 10-week cycles. It was established in an annex of the school and utilized Yeshiva University personnel and materials. Although for the most part the teachers were young, inexperienced, recent graduates of the University, the parents of the children believed that this aspect of the project was superior to the regular reading program in the school. As the first 10-week cycle neared completion, the parents protested their children's return to the regular school. As a result, the first cycle, which began late, in November, was extended to 13 weeks, permitting only two cycles that year. Only 43 of the proposed 100 children were able to participate in the Learning Center.

Because of the feelings aroused during this conflict, two of the staff members most familiar with contingency management resigned and could not be replaced.

Although the Learning Center was judged to be successful by parents and students, it cannot be assessed positively in terms of actual reading gains achieved. During the school year, students gained 6 months in reading, but all continued to read, on an average, two years below grade norm.

The experimental curriculum used in the fourth grade Saturation aspect of the project was also unsuccessful, for teachers were unfamiliar with the new reading and science materials that were introduced. Some gains were made by 30 fourth-grade students who received special tutoring in mathematics as part of the experiment. There was some individualized or small group instruction in reading, but none in other subject areas. While additional personnel were provided, class size was not reduced permanently and was generally considered too large for small-group instruction. The curriculum development specialist was often used for other purposes, including substituting for absent teachers.

The Science phase of the project was characterized by adversity from its beginning. The commercial science materials were delivered late, postponing the program's beginning until late spring. Moreover, teachers found the workbooks beyond the students' reading capacity.

The plans for the Inservice Training aspect included seminars with visiting consultants, demonstration lessons, and individual guidance and consultation. Although project personnel and supervisors of the P129 project made themselves available for consultation, Yeshiva University consultants were not available to the extent that they were needed. Because their expectations could not be met, the morale of the school's regular teachers was lowered and they tended to withdraw their cooperation; ultimately, they were openly hostile toward the project and its personnel.

In reality the Governing Board, the major thrust of the Decentralization element, governed very little. It was established to administer the project, but members were frustrated by their lack of financial and executive powers. The Governing Board had little impact on school policy, since it was under direct control of the local school board and the District Superintendent.

A study of More Effective Schools and P129 permits contrasting two experiments. It has been shown that More Effective Schools, with the support of its teaching and administrative staff, has been enthusiastically endorsed by a majority of those involved in the project. They have expanded their greatest teaching efforts to the furtherance of the program. Evaluation has shown, however, that the program continues to suffer from inadequate numbers of qualified, competent teachers who can relinquish old teaching

methods for the new styles more attuned to the innovative concepts of More Effective Schools. The P129 project incorporated various approaches of spirited innovation; its lack of success can no doubt be attributed to unrealistic and inadequate planning and failure to assess the needs of the school. Moreover, the magnitude of what was intended in this project was in complete disharmony with its meager budget.

Although the evaluators recommended recycling P129 with modifications, it was not recycled. Students of PS 129K would probably benefit more if a new project were developed -- one designed specifically to meet their needs. However, certain project elements, notably contingency management, appear to be worthy of future consideration, provided that adequate planning and training take place.

The atmosphere in which programs function must be considered. No project can succeed wihtout staff acceptance and community support. Because antagonisms between PS 129K faculty, Project Beacon staff, and community members serving on the Governing Board were permitted to erupt and continue, hostilities developed that resulted in faculty, and, to a lesser extent, community rejection of the project. More Effective Schools on the other hand, has made a better beginning, and is held in great esteem by its advocates as a model for the future, despite the lack of demonstrable improvement in reading and mathematics. These experiments clearly demonstrate the need for establishing and maintaining lines of communication among all concerned.

CHAPTER VII

MOTIVATIONAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Marge Benjamin

The projects grouped under Motivational Academic programs include those that provide intensive services to pupils without special behavior problems or physical handicaps, in order to motivate them to continue their education. Most of these projects serve high-school age youth who volunteer, or who are selected on the basis of rigorous criteria. The projects take place in a variety of settings -- in the traditional school or more innovatively in community agencies, in storefront centers, and on job sites. Teachers are supplemented by paraprofessionals, student street workers, or guidance and health specialists. While many problems of implementation remain unsolved, and while these projects have involved little change in curriculum and teaching methods, they were, in many instances, notably successful. Perhaps these successes reflect the feeling of "specialness" on the part of the participants -- both staff and students -- who have been singled out for a particular project.

Motivational Academic projects, although receiving a small portion of the total Title I funds in New York City, represent an increasingly larger share of the total -- less than 2 percent in 1965-66, approximately 3 percent in 1966-67, and 8 percent in 1967-68. The projects are arranged in three components, College Preparation, School Retention, and Vocational Preparation programs. Table VII-1 shows the amount budgeted and the percent expended for the projects in each of the components for 1965-66 through the Summer 1968. The two College Preparation projects, College Discovery and Development and College Bound, together account for the largest portion of funds budgeted in this program area; the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer project is the next largest, followed by programs for pregnant girls. The other projects are quite small in scope.

COLLEGE PREPARATION PROGRAM COMPONENT

The College Discovery and Development project and College Bound were designed to improve academic performance and college readiness for disadvantaged high school students whose potential exceeds their performance. College Discovery and Development was initiated in 1965 and is located in five high schools, one in each borough. The selected students travel to the centers which function as a school-within-a-school. The project is administered jointly by the Board of Education and The City University of New York, which guarantees to College Discovery and Development graduates admission to one of its units. College Discovery and Development features small classes, intensive guidance services, cultural enrichment, and tutoring by college students. Each year a new ninth-grade class is accepted into the program.

TABLE VII-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR MOTIVATIONAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer'67		1967-67 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENT AND PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
COLLEGE PREPARATION	552	82	1,504	86	4,493
College Discovery and Development	552	82	1,147	87	1,210
College Bound	-	-	356	83	3,283
SCHOOL RETENTION	-	-	104	28	483
Pregnant Girls	-	-	104	28	310
Operation Return	-	-	-	-	115
Street Academies	-	-	-	-	58
VOCATIONAL PREPARATION	278	73	242	95	371
Neighborhood Youth Corps	278	73	242	95	273
Benjamin Franklin Cluster	-	-	-	-	98
MISCELLANEOUS	-	-	27	96	62
PEP	-	-	16	94	23
Hospital Schools, Summer	-	-	11	98	[c]
Camping for Leadership	-	-	-	-	39
TOTAL	$830	79%	$1,877	84%	$5,409

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Funded under State Urban Education Program.

College Bound began full-scale operation in 1967-68. In the spring of the previous academic year a planning grant was obtained to plan this project, and in the Summer 1967 a small pilot project was initiated for 2200 high school-aged students. In goals and services College Bound is similar to the College Discovery and Development project, but it is larger and more diffused, currently being based in 27 high schools. One hundred colleges and universities, including The City University, form the College Bound Corporation, whereby a member college adopts a particular high school, offering students preadmission counseling and tutorial and general assistance, and agrees to admit successful graduates. Ninth and tenth graders are selected for College Bound on the basis of achievement, attendance, conduct, and poverty. The ethnic background of the students reflects the racial composition of the school and of the City. Because of the selection criteria there was some difficulty in assembling a balance of students functioning on or below grade level as originally proposed; as a result, the College Bound student group is functioning at a higher grade level than was planned. The Summer 1967 project cycle stressed intensive remediation and auxiliary services.[1] A feature of the full-year project is parallel programming of subject matter classes based on ability groupings, with flexibility in pupil assignment. In many of the participating high school teachers volunteered for the assignment.

By all reports, College Discovery and Development has been successful; it has been commended by the New York State Title I Coordinator, and cited as "outstanding" by the United States Office of Education. College entrance figures are impressive; of 550 students who entered the program in 1965, two-thirds earned academic diplomas, and almost two-thirds of the entrants went on to higher education. College admission statistics favor girls and Puerto Ricans.

Since College Bound did not actually begin operation until 1967, there are as yet no comparable college admission figures. In the summer pilot project, students made significant gains in subject area achievement, surpassing control groups. In neither project was there evidence of innovative or creative curricula, instructional methods, or teacher training.

Follow through at the college level is crucial to judging the long-term success of both projects. The obligation on the part of colleges should go beyond acceptance to provide special help or encouragement to the student while in college. The Board of Directors of the College Bound Corporation is presently discussing mechanisms for improving

---

[1] Summer enrichment services to junior high school students in residence at Skidmore College is a feature of PEP (Programs to Excite Potential), a Title III project; Title I funds provided transportation and living costs. PEP is the only New York City project combining funds under Titles I and III.

the college retention rate of minority group students, including counseling, student stipends, and special courses; some member colleges are trying a buddy system, pairing an experienced college student with an incoming freshman.

Further research is needed to identify the significant factors -- such as the selection of students, the selection of staff, the concentrated guidance services -- making these college oriented programs successful and special; such information would provide a basis for upgrading the quality of the high school experience for all students.

SCHOOL RETENTION PROGRAM COMPONENT

Another group of three projects had as a major aim continued schooling for youngsters traditionally barred from classes -- the so-called push-outs (pregnant girls or suspended students), and the dropouts who elect to leave school before the legal age.

The project for Pregnant Girls evolved as a pilot project in one center in 1967; by the following year it had grown to five centers, three of which were funded by Title I. Girls with medical certification of pregnancy were offered the opportunity to continue their education, and to receive training in child care, personal hygiene, and vocational skills. In special facilities linked with hospital maternity clinics, the girls received year-round attention in small classes, including guidance, health and nutrition, and some training in business subjects.

The evaluators felt that the project had the potential of holding the girls in school. Although attendance at the centers was irregular, most students were enthusiastic, and judged the program more stimulating than their regular school experience. In 1968, the evaluators felt that the project objectives were being met for the major[illegible] of the girls. Of the girls who had attended one center, and who did [illegible]t go to work after delivery, almost all returned to school and remained in school to the end of the year. Followup studies are needed to evaluate sustained attendance in regular school. Much of the success of this program was attributed to the dedication and quality of the personnel. Expansion of facilities was recommended. Infant-care facilities are also needed to enable the young mother to return to school.

This demonstration project has paved the way for developing techniques to meet the needs of a limited number of school-age pregnant girls. Its effectiveness has changed Board of Education citywide policy, and is a clear example of the spread of the benefits of a Title I-initiated activity to non-Title I students throughout the City. As a result of this project pregnant girls are no longer automatically suspended from school, and young mothers have the option of transferring

to a new school after delivery. Moreover, the Board changed its rules so that pregnant teachers may now remain longer at their jobs, instead of having to go on maternity leave at a specified point in pregnancy.

The Title I project designed to serve students suspended from elementary, junior high, and high schools was initiated on a pilot basis in the Spring 1968. Operation Return offered small-group remedial instruction and provided family assistants to work with the student's family. The objective of the project was to return the suspended student to regular school. The clinical staff of psychologists and social workers sought to help the student acquire adaptive social skills. Classes were held in community agencies as well as school buildings, and were taught by teachers who specifically elected to work with these children. A paraprofessional was assigned to each class of eight students.

The participating staff rated the project as having quite positive effects on students' enthusiasm, on their cooperation in class, and on respect for others. The project had some positive effect on students' achievement and attitudes. Supervisors and evaluators rated the teachers' performance and sensitivity to students' problems as high.

A third school retention program, the Benjamin Franklin Street Academies, was initiated with Title I funds in 1967. Originally the project aimed at an operation similar to the Urban League Street Academies,[2] but it was subsequently modified to stress preventive work with potential dropouts, since adequate numbers of actual dropouts could not be recruited. The original storefront was augmented by a second, in which licensed Board of Education teachers taught during school hours. A major focus of the project was the role of the student advisors (street workers) who attempted to achieve rapport with students, develop their leadership qualities, and provide them with guidance in personal problems. The street workers were available to the students 24 hours a day, seven days a week. These services were designed to effect a positive change in behavior and to raise aspiration levels, in addition to providing educational rehabilitation.

The goal of reaching 300 students each year proved unrealistic; 60 students were served intensively during the one-year operation. Of these 60, 15 graduated from the Academy to an Urban League preparatory school or to the next grade at Benjamin Franklin High School. There were a series of problems. The athletic program was apparently effective,

---

[2]The Urban League Street Academies were initiated in 1963, as an alternative educational process for students who had dropped out of high school. Classes are held in storefronts and are structured in three successive stages: street academies, academies of transition, and preparatory schools.

as were the field trips, but the latter were handicapped by limited funds. Serious funding problems resulted in the late payment of staff salaries and delayed purchase of materials and repairs. There was no evidence of any training for the staff, and in the second center in particular, there was little community involvement.

The number of students studied intensively was disappointingly small; there is a definite need for more intensive study, particularly followup on the students served, to compare their performance before and after attendance at the Academies.

The big problem is how to identify dropouts before they drop out, and how to adapt and expand efforts designed to keep them in school, or to return them to school. Since a goal of college attendance for all students is unrealistic, real alternatives, including vocational training, should be offered. If the Street Academy model is followed, affiliation with a college or university should be sought so that staff can be trained and new, appropriate curricula can be developed.

VOCATIONAL PREPARATORY PROGRAM COMPONENT

The final component included in the Motivational Academic program area has school retention as its objective, with an emphasis on vocational preparation. Two projects are included.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps project, prior to the ESEA, was funded completely by tax levy, and in the years covered in this study the project was funded partly by Title I and partly by U.S. Department of Labor funds. The Department of Labor funds are used to pay students for jobs. The program is run jointly by the local community action agencies, which administer the vocational aspect, and by the Board of Education, which runs the educational aspect. The educational program offers remediation and enrichment for ten hours a week during the summer (generally on the job site) for about 3,000 youngsters.

The project was judged to fill a definite need, to be moderately successful, and to have great potential. Enrollees' attitudes toward self and school were rated as improved, but unfortunately school retention figures are not available. The vocational aspects did not fare as well. Jobs for the students were scarce, pay scales were low, and students often did not get paid on time.

There was some conflict between the Board of Education and several of the community action agencies, because of diversity in objectives. In addition, the evaluators noted deficiencies in the coordination of the project in different areas of the City. In general, the role of the curriculum specialists was not defined, and school records were not

used appropriately. Recommendations were for improvement in curriculum, physical facilities for instruction, teacher training, and job placement screening.

The Benjamin Franklin Cluster project was designed by the schools' teachers[3] to restructure classes for 320 ninth-graders of high academic ability with the goal of fostering a sense of belonging and an orientation to the world of work.[4] The special ninth-grades classes were to be organized as a school-within-a-school, in contrast to the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps project. Paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, and supportive clinical personnel augmented the work of teachers.

The first year of operation (1967-68) was judged more negative than positive. Because there were difficulties in assembling the proposed target population, academic requirements for participation were lowered. Although the cluster plan and individualized instruction were implemented, and students and teachers felt closer, many defects were noted. Among these were failure to revise curriculum content, poor physical facilities, poorly implemented coordination with Teachers College (Columbia), administrative tangles, and ineffective parent involvement. Students were dissatisfied with the social limitations of cluster classes, and attendance was poor.

These problems stemmed largely from lack of planning and an inadequate level of funding. The vocational orientation program, composed of trips and lectures, was good, the evaluators felt. They recommended teacher training and supervision; expansion of attendance, social work, and psychological services; remedial reading; redefinition of paraprofessionals' roles; and more guidance from the University. The program was continued in 1968-69 using decentralized Title I funds.

In summary, all the Motivational Academic projects had several things in common -- they offered small classes and individualized instruction, and featured supportive services such as guidance, health, and home-school liaison. Implementation was uneven, goals were sometimes unrealistic, and there was only moderate emphasis on innovative curriculum and teaching practices. Staff are groping for techniques to make schooling more meaningful to these students. Yet these programs are among the most exceptional efforts in Title I.

---

[3] At the request of the Franklin Improvement Program Committee (FIPC), a school-community-university organization.

[4] This project is included in the vocational preparation category, although this is only one aspect of its program.

One of the major lessons to be learned from the Motivational Academic projects is that even in the absence of specific curricular adaptations, teacher training, or other innovative improvements, they tend to be successful. Students tend to make gains in achievement, to remain in school, or to return to school. Moreover, these projects appear exciting and special to the participating students and staff, and to outside concerned persons. It is probably true that these students were more carefully screened than the students participating in other projects, and they seem highly motivated. The more successful of these projects have restricted the target population to an identifiable group of students, designated on the basis of a single immediate need. These projects tend to concentrate efforts to meet the particular need. To make these projects the model for the future, the variables associated with project success should be identified so that all projects may be expanded with the same success that has characterized these projects.

CHAPTER VIII

SUPPLEMENTARY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The Supplementary Academic program area -- including projects for both public and nonpublic school children -- provides special academic instruction to supplement that of the regular classroom. These projects usually emphasize services to elementary level children with academic deficiencies, and some also provide enrichment activities. Many of these projects operate after the regular school day or school year.

The projects have been treated in three major component groups; Afterschool and Summer, Corrective Reading and Mathematics, and English-as-a-Second Language. In the 1966-67 school year, these projects accounted for 13 percent of the total Title I funds budgeted, and in size were second only to the budget for the Regular Academic projects; by 1967-68, the budget for the group of Supplementary Academic projects had been reduced to 3 percent of the total Title I budget. Table VIII-1 on the following page shows the amount budgeted and the percentage of funds expended for these projects. Afterschool and Summer projects was the largest component in the early years, but by the third year many projects had been shifted to State Urban Education Program; the recycling of afterschool centers was left to the discretion of the districts, and these activities were often continued with decentralized Title I funds; English-as-a-Second Language was introduced in 1967-68 with two projects, one for public school children and one for children attending nonpublic schools.

AFTERSCHOOL AND SUMMER PROGRAM COMPONENT

Afterschool and Summer projects existed in New York City prior to the ESEA, but were limited. Summer schools had been instituted to give the student who had failed a course, or who needed to repeat the course, an opportunity to do so in the summer. With the advent of Title I, summer school opportunities increased dramatically in size and scope. Prior to Title I, 24 elementary schools operated a summer program; in the summer 1966 Title I funds were used to expand this Summer Day Elementary School project to 86 schools in disadvantaged communities. Other elementary schools in more advantaged areas were supported with City funds. The Junior High School summer project was completely funded under Title I, and the High School projects were expanded. For the first time, as a result of the availability of Title I funds, summer activities were also made available to Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed children. In addition to providing remediation and opportunities to make up failures, these summer programs offered enrichment activities, music and art, activities for intellectually gifted children, instruction in English-as-a-Second Language, and speech.

In the fall of 1965, afterschool study centers in public elementary

TABLE VIII-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR SUPPLEMENTRY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENTS AND PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
AFTERSCHOOL AND SUMMER	7,128	64	7,763	92	—
ASSC	1,139	88	3,989	80	—
Educational Enrichment	1,832	40	—	—	—
Remedial Centers	262	51	—	—	—
ASSC, IS201	—	—	75	59	—
Summer Schools	3,894	68	3,699	106	c
CORRECTIVE	476	39	1,812	76	1,638
Reading	476	39	886	88	914
Mathematics	—	—	926	64	724
ENGLISH, 2nd LANGUAGE	—	—	—	—	756
Public Schools	—	—	—	—	655
Nonpublic Schools	—	—	—	—	101
TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY ACADEMIC PROGRAM	$7,603	62%	$9,576	89%	$2,394

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Funded under State Urban Education Program.

and junior high schools provided remedial and tutorial instruction in reading and mathematics; these centers were organized in many of the same schools selected for the Open Enrollment, Improved Services, More Effective Schools, and Transitional Schools projects. Later in the year, two projects for nonpublic school children were intitated; an Educational Enrichment project in art, music, health education, and library was established in public schools during the regular school day or after school hours. The other project for nonpublic school children -- Remedial and Tutorial Afterschool Centers -- was originally located on the premises of the nonpublic schools, but largely as a result of the opposition of some civic groups to this use of Title I funds, the centers were moved to public school premises. In 1966-67 the afterschool projects were combined for funding purposes; they operated on public school premises, and were open to both public and nonpublic school children. The sessions generally ran from shortly after 3 P.M. to 5 P.M., three days a week.

There had been a sharp distinction in the pupil requirements for participation in enrichment and remedial activities. To be eligible for remedial instruction, a student ordinarily had to be one or two years retarded in the subject area. In contrast, to participate in the enrichment activities, a pupil had to be reading at grade level. The intention was to provide remedial and enrichment activities to different groups of children, but there was in fact overlap. It was found that enrichment could be used to motivate children to participate in the remedial program; particularly in those instances where attendance or registration was a problem, a promise of enrichment activities along with remedial ones provided incentive for the children.

The Remedial and Tutorial Afterschool project was judged to be a limited success. The students overcame some of their deficiencies in reading, as measured by standardized tests, but most did not reach grade level. In the first year the greatest gains were made by third-grade pupils. In the summer projects some students also gained, sometimes as much as half a year during the six-week session, but were still not up to grade expectation.

The effects of enrichment activities on pupils are more difficult to judge; objective measures are not available, and the existing tests of performance or appreciation are inappropriate. Perhaps the effectiveness of these activities must be judged by the quality of instruction, and by the interest and other reactions of the students. Generally, the enrichment activities were better attended, and were rated by the staff as more interesting to the students, than were the remedial aspects. These findings are not surprising and lend confirmation to the motivational value of enrichment activities.

Attendance in the summer was generally better than attendance after school hours. Attendance was best for enrichment activities in the summer; it was satisfactory in the summer remedial reading and mathematics sessions. Attendance was a severe problem in the afterschool centers,

because of the location of the centers and the timing. In the winter, the sessions ended so late that the child would have to go home alone after dark, unless an adult came for him. Since the centers were not always at neighborhood schools, some children had a long trip. In the spring attendance again fell because the centers had to compete with outdoor play. Attendance was so consistently a problem in the afterschool projects that their potential value was seriously diminished.

The Afterschool and Summer projects recruited volunteers; there was no requirement that anyone attend if he did not want to. This may have resulted in a select population, including children who were better motivated, or encouraged by their parents. The projects made no attempt to recruit the harder to reach, many of whom probably could have benefited greatly from the services offered. Since adequate records were not kept, little is known about the number of kinds of children who attended.

These projects suffered from many other complications. Instructional materials and supplies were invariably late in arriving and in some instances never were delivered. There were great difficulties in recruiting staff, and not enough time devoted to training them. Students' home school records were not made available to the afterschool and summer projects, so part of the project time was consumed in collecting information that was already on record elsewhere. Furthermore, records were not sent back to the child's home school, so the regular school often had no idea of the progress made nor of the recommendations of the project staff.

Despite these limitations, Afterschool and Summer projects represent a real opportunity for experimentation because the activities need not be bound by the same rules that govern the regular school day and year. These projects have a more relaxed and freer atmosphere. Generally class size is small. It should be possible, therefore, to establish good criteria for student selection, to gain some insight into pupil motivation, to select teachers of demonstrated ability, and to implement creative techniques and approaches without great cost and disruption of the traditional academic sequence. The summer time and after school time provide an ideal setting where new ideas could be developed and tried out, which has not been used to advantage. Nor have the more traditional activities been implemented effectively.

CORRECTIVE PROGRAM COMPONENT

The Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics projects funded under Title I were designed to provide children attending nonpublic schools with the same kinds of remedial services that already existed for children in public schools. These opportunities were new to nonpublic school children, although the content of the materials and the teaching techniques were based on experiences in the public schools.

In the early years, and to some extent later, logistical difficulties interfered with the projects' effectiveness. Supplies were very delayed in arrival. Regulations governing salaries and the general shortage of teachers made it impossible to recruit enough experienced teachers to implement the programs fully. Despite special training and recruitment efforts, (see chapter on Teacher Training Programs) positions were often unfilled, or were filled at odd times during the project; many of the corrective teachers left during the program, which meant discontinuance of the project in a school. Although some inservice training was offered, the corrective teachers were generally inexperienced and needed more training and orientation to the educational milieu of the nonpublic schools.

The Title I eligibility requirements are such that most eligible nonpublic schools participate in both Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics, in addition to Guidance Clinics and Bus Trips. Scheduling these activities was difficult, causing some disruption to the schools. Children received corrective instruction in small groups of about 10, for about one hour or two half-hours once or twice a week, and were continually leaving and returning to the regular classroom. Recently, parents of children attending nonpublic schools have asked that no instruction take place in regular classrooms during the time their children are excused for special instruction. Complying with this request would mean there would be little time for regular teaching.

There was also a severe shortage of space in the nonpublic schools, and many corrective classes were held in auditoriums, gymnasia, and cafeterias. As the schools and the project coordinators gained more experience with scheduling, the effects of many of the organizational problems lessened. The problems still remain severe, however, for the individual child who may participate in more than one project.

Selection criteria were established for pupil participation. If the child was achieving one or two years below grade level in the subject area he was eligible for corrective instruction. No directions were included in the project proposals describing specific measures of low achievement to be used. This permitted the schools great latitude. In many instances pupils were selected on the basis of a recommendation by the classroom teacher or principal; this was not necessarily a drawback since these people are conversant with the needs of the children in the school. However, as the evaluators indicated, the reasons for some of the recommendations were disciplinary or behavioral, and not simply poor achievement in reading or mathematics. Inclusion of children with nonacademic problems will, of course, dilute the effects of the services for all participants. Selection criteria should be developed to limit the participants to those demonstrating specific academic needs. Children whose most pressing needs are nonacademic should participate in other projects, specifically tailored to them.

In 1966-67, the Informal Textbook Test was used to select children for the Corrective Reading project. This test is a very crude procedure,

and depends to a great extent on the experience of the examiner and the book he uses; it does not provide diagnostic information nor useful scores. It may be necessary to develop a better selection measure, one that is more sensitive, to premit diagnostic of specific problems.

Some consideration should be given to the concept of retardation as a requirement for pupil participation. Retardation in a particular subject area is relative; like everything else, the ability to learn is distrubed over a wide range, and some children will remain behind grade level regardless of the type or amount of instruction they receive. Special programs may be necessary for children who have a basic learning difficulty or who are extremely far behind. Excluding from participation those children whose test performance places them near or above grade level works special hardships for the more able students who, in fact, may also have reading difficulties. Many children are educationally deprived without falling behind on standardized tests. Some consideration should be given to improving their skills so they too can use their full potential.

The results of the Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics projects, in terms of improved achievement of participating students, were often disappointing, although technical problems involved in testing, record-keeping, and in assessing the quality of instruction precludes definitive statements. By the 1967-68 year, the evaluators of the Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics projects concluded that there were greater gains than would be expected for children in a regular classroom situation, particularly for younger children, and thus they considered the projects successful.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM COMPONENT

During the 1967-68 school year two projects for teaching English-as-a-Second Language were inaugurated, one for public school children and the other for children attending nonpublic schools.

The major objective of the nonpublic school project was to improve pupils proficiency in English so that they could participate effectively in standard instructional courses. A total of 1250 students in grades 1 to 8 participated; based on sample data, 60 percent of the children had a Spanish language background. Twenty-three licensed retired teachers and teachers on maternity leave were assigned to 32 nonpublic schools to provide instruction to students selected by them from among those recommended by regular school staff. This was an improvement over the selection procedures developed for the Corrective Programs.

The model for the project was very similar to that for the Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics projects. Many of the problems were organizational; facilities were woefully inadequate, materials were not available or were inadequate, and scheduling of groups was poor. These problems are quite similar to the initial start-up difficulties experienced over

and over in implementing a project in the nonpublic schools.

Project teachers indicated that most of the pupils in the nonpublic schools project made notable progress in English skills. Pupils made gains in regular classroom subjects as well -- in reading and spelling for some students, and in mathematics, science, and history for others. Project staff, regular school staff, and the evaluators felt that the project was worthy of expansion, especially to the kindergarten level. If addition resources are not forthcoming, the evaluators recommended reducing the total number of participants so that there could be a reduction in size of the instructional groups and an increase in the number of sessions provided.

The project in the public schools was very different in the population it sought to reach and in the techniques and methods it employed. It was directed exclusively to children to Spanish-speaking backgrounds in more than 100 public schools. There were six project elements; the major ones included training for district coordinators, inservice training for teachers, and limited use of special commercial materials.

Very often, the project personnel did not clearly understand the aims of the project and felt that they did not receive enough training nor enough supervision. The evaluators felt that the criteria for selecting the project schools and participating children were inadequate, and that the project elements could have been better articulated.

The Supplementary Academic projects offer unusual opportunities that have not been exploited. Since all these projects operate, to a greater or lesser extent, outside the formal school schedule, they offer a relaxed atmosphere, small instructional groups, and the possibility of individualizing instruction for children with demonstrated need who seem to have the incentive or can be motivated to learn.

These projects have been beset by major problems, although the project conditions are theoretically ideal. The first series of problems was mainly organizational, and could have been more quickly resolved with more adequate planning. During the three years under study, these problems have tended to become less severe, as a result of experience with them. However, as has been indicated in the English-as-a-Second Language project in the nonpublic schools, each new project may be prey to the same complications faced by prior projects. These start-up problems should now be anticipated, especially in the light of several years experience, and could be forestalled with more advance and careful preparation.

The other important source of difficulty has been with the pupil selection procedures and with the type and quantity of services offered. Although flexible, the selection criteria have been specific, but the projects continue to include some children selected on the basis of other, predominantly behavioral, criteria. Many of the children, as we will

indicate in the chapter on Nonpublic School Participation in Title I, participate in several projects because of multiple deficiencies. If a group of children can be selected so that they all have a single, major problem in common, the project activities could be better focused, and new approaches to meeting the problem could be developed and tried out. The present resources could be more concentrated, without an increase in the quantity of services provided to each participant. If Title I is to be a search for effective methods of educating deprived children, these projects seem to provide an ideal structure for future Title I projects.

CHAPTER IX

ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

Judith A. Eisler

These Title I projects proposed to enrich the school experience of poor children by affording them opportunities, which otherwise they would not be likely to have, to participate in activities such as bus trips to places of civic and cultural interest, a student talent show, and interscholastic sports.

Table IX-1 below shows the amount budgeted and the percent expended for enrichment projects from 1965 to 1968. These discrete

TABLE IX-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
PROJECT	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Interscholastic Athletics	352	36	--	--	--
Musical Talent Showcase	--	--	9	76	--
Bus Trips	--	--	112	51	108
TOTAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	$352	36%	$121	53%	$118[c]

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Included in this total is a $10,000 project National Environment Education Development Program, which was originally planned at a Title I project but was later funded as a State Urban Education Act project, and was not subtracted from the Title I budget statement.

enrichment projects constitute a very small portion of the Title I effort, 0.5 percent of the total amount of funds budgeted in 1965-66, and an even smaller investment thereafter. The percentage of budgeted funds expended in the first two years underscores the poor implementation of these projects. None was recycled except the Bus Trips project for children attending nonpublic schools, which in its first year started in January, and in the second year in November.

Although these project proposals list objectives concerning both attitudes toward school and academic achievement, the projects are not primarily academic in nature. The Bus Trips project sought to improve students' motivation to learn and thereby to improve their academic performance. Title I funds provided for rental of buses; all other arrangements were the responsibility of the participating schools. The Musical Talent Showcase sought to increase the students' awarness of their worth, to expand their knowledge, and also to provide an entertaining and enlightening assembly program for Summer Day Elementary Schools in specific poverty areas. The Interscholastic Athletic project aimed to effect positive changes in students' attitudes toward school, and thus to help reduce the dropout rate, although this project provided only athletic equipment, facilities, and staff.

Whether projects such as these meet the educational needs of poor children, and whether it can reasonably be expected that they will help to ensure that "poverty will no longer be a bar to learning and [that] learning shall offer an escape from poverty,"[1] -- the motivating spirit of the law -- are questions of crucial importance. What makes them questions difficult to answer is, in part, the nature of the relationship between enrichment, motivation to learn, and academic achievement.

It is reasonable to assume that the wider an individual's range of experience is, the more interested he will be in the world around him and the more likely he will be to seek to understand and become involved in it. However, what is less reasonable to assume is that a few enrichment activities will have an immediate, measurable impact on motivation to learn or improved academic performance. This purported relationship between enrichment, motivation to learn, and academic achievement, which underlies the stated objectives of the enrichment projects, has not been tested. We have, however, seen some suggestion in the chapter on Supplementary Academic Programs, that such activities may have motivational value.

Assuming that enrichment activities may have a positive effect on academic performance, questions of the type, quality, and scope of activities are germane. That is, how much exposure to what kinds of experience is necessary for such activities to effect a change in pupil performance?

---

[1]Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, op. cit.

In 1967 the Bus Trips project proposed three trips per pupil, and in 1968, 1.5 trips per pupil. Trips were held during the regular school day and usually lasted about 4 to 5 hours. Typical destinations for third and fourth graders included visits to the Bronx Zoo, the Aquarium, and the Museum of Natural History. Older students went to places like the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Lincoln Center, and the United Nations. Teachers accompanied their own classes, and typically one or two other adults, usually parents and occasionally other teachers, were present. Problems, when encountered, revolved mainly around trip planning and organization, and the lack of coordination among the Board of Education, the bus company, the school, and the trip site personnel. Approximately 67,000 nonpublic school children were eligible to participate in the first year of the project's operation, and 85,000 in the second year. The evaluation reports do not present the total number of children who actually participated in the project, nor the number of trips each child took. Even assuming that each child went on three trips, the evaluators of the Bus Trips for 1967 and 1968 concluded that in view of the limited degree of participation, observable measurable changes in classroom performance and attitudes toward learning could not realistically be assessed.

In contrast with the stated long-range educational objectives of the Bus Trips project were the more immediate objectives of the Musical Talent Showcase. This project sought to give public and nonpublic high school students an opportunity to publicly demonstrate their talents and value; and it sought to expose both the performers and the audiences to a special field of knowledge, the musical contributions of minority group people.

To realize these objectives, a group of 20 musically talented high school students, with the help of a teacher-coordinator, prepared, during May and June 1967, a talent show program which would be presented as an assembly program for public and nonpublic school children attending Summer Day Elementary Schools. The performers were paid $1.50 an hour for a total of 175 hours, including rehearsal and performance time.

While the underlying assumptions of this project were that it would help improve the sense of self-worth of disadvantaged children and that this improved self-image would have positive effects on their motivation to learn, and in turn on their classroom performance, the operational objectives were concrete, specific, and short-range; furthermore, they could be identified, implemented, and assessed. That is, although the program was predicated on the ultimate educational objective -- improvement in academic performance -- the project was designed in such a way as to provide for the achievement of more immediate goals, the attainment of which was subject to investigation.

These differences in the nature of the objectives of the Musical Talent Showcase and the Bus Trips projects raise important issues for consideration. If it can be established that enrichment activities do

have significant educational relevance for low-income minority group children, then program planners must address themselves to the question of what kinds of activities have the greatest impact on achievement. Are the most effective activities those that have more immediate and concrete goals like the Musical Talent Showcase, rather than those with longer-term and less specific objectives, like the Bus Trips? Are they those that call for the active rather than relatively passive participation of students (e.g., participating in a talent show versus going on a bus trip)? Are they those that take place during the regular school year or those that operate during the summer months? Moreover, are there ways of planning these enrichment projects so as to establish and measure immediate goals, and simultaneously to establish connections with ultimate goals?

If the objective of enrichment projects is to improve scholastic performance, the projects must be designed in such a way as to purposefully relate to academic growth. For example, one evaluator suggested that the preparation time for the bus trips could be used to provide instruction to pupils in geography, map reading, and the relation between travel time and distance. To expect bus trips alone to improve pupil motivation to learn and to raise academic achievement, without relating trips to classroom activities in some meaningful way, limits the possible impact of such a project. If enrichment activities are to have any educational relevance at all, they must be thoughtfully planned and integrally related to the learning process as a whole; in some cases this may mean a need for additional specific teacher training and preparation, without which these projects would be of little value to the children.

Teachers involved in the bus trips expressed the need for greater familiarization with the sites prior to the trips, so that they could better prepare the children. According to one evaluator, however, "it was not clear from the teachers' replies to what extent they would in future take the initiative to get necessary information; some seemed to imply that they felt more information should be furnished to them."[2] Evaluators report that in some instances the preparation of the children for trips consisted of little more than a review of routine procedures and explanations of desirable behavior, while in other cases it was extensive, with corresponding differences noted in the value of the trips to the children. If students were also involved in the selection and planning of trips and followup activities, they might be more active participants.

---

[2] Rita Senf, Bus Transportation to Places of Civic and Cultural Interest in New York City for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, Center for Urban Education, September 1967.

For the most part students enjoyed enrichment activities. The expectation that these activities will have immediate, observable measurable effects on actual academic performance may be an unreasonable assumption and not a necessary project goal or evaluation concern. In funding these activities it has been assumed that they influence pupil motivation; it would seem important to explore the nature of this assumption. If these projects expose deprived children to things they would not otherwise be likely to experience, and are therefore worthwhile, then the time, money, and energy would be better spent in designing enrichment activities in such a way as to provide an opportunity for demonstrable intellectual growth. Evaluation efforts accordingly should focus on identifying the most valuable activities, and on establishing effective ways to implement them to ensure their greatest possible motivational and interest value for children.

CHAPTER X

SPEECH PROGRAMS

Marge Benjamin

Speech projects for both public and nonpublic school children have been of two basic types, Basic Speech Improvement designed to improve the speech patterns of otherwise normal students, and Clinical Therapy for the remediation of serious speech defects.

A relatively small amount of all Title I program money was budgeted for speech; for the first three years combined, a total of $1.2 million was allotted to speech projects. In the first year, all speech projects, and especially the nonpublic school Basic Speech Improvement project, reflected a low level of implementation, as indicated by the small percentage of funds expended (see Table X-1 on the following page.) By the second year, larger percentages of funds were expended, especially in the clinical-therapeutic speech projects; the Summer 1967 Speech Therapy Clinics expended approximately 93 percent of its budget. Overall, the increase in amounts expended in this program area from the first to the second year was from about 45 to 65 percent.

BASIC SPEECH IMPROVEMENT COMPONENT

The design for the 1965-66 Basic Speech Improvement project was developed on the basis of prior experience in the More Effective Schools project. The Title I Basic Speech Improvement project operated for two years in the public schools, and less than one year in the nonpublic schools. For this project, a speech specialist conducted instruction in listening and speaking skills for whole classes. The grade spread was from 1 through 9 in 25 public schools and 8 nonpublic schools. The evaluation reports do not make clear the basis for the selection of participating classes.

The underlying premise of this project was that the speech of poor children is often fragmented and inarticulate. The instructional goals included the development of "self-expression and cultural enrichment through group discussions and oral reporting" but nowhere in the project description were the instructional procedures and techniques outlined.

Implementation problems in the nonpublic schools were particularly acute, but the project also suffered in the public schools. Teacher recruitment difficulties often led to the hiring of inexperienced and unqualified personnel for both the public and nonpublic schools' projects.[1] Classroom teachers who were supposed to observe the specialist and provide follow-through often did neither. There was little consultation

---

[1]A teacher recruitment project for speech teachers was proposed for the Spring 1966, but was never implemented.

TABLE X-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED, FOR SPEECH PROGRAMS
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENTS AND PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
BASIC SPEECH IMPROVEMENT	246	45	377	58	—
Public Schools	201	50	377	58	—
Nonpublic Schools	45	22	—	—	—
CLINICAL THERAPY	133	46	268	75	210
Nonpublic Schools	133	46	222	71	210
Clinics, Summer	—	—	46	93	c
TOTAL	$379	45%	$645	65%	$210

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Funded under State Urban Education Program.

between the classroom teachers and specialists. In general, neither classroom teachers nor specialists clearly understood the aims of the project.

In the nonpublic schools, many project positions were not filled at all, and others were filled by unqualified persons. Since the planning was inadequate, the schools had difficulty integrating the project into their ongoing porgrams. The nonpublic school operation started very late in the first year, and this project did not operate for a long enough period to allow for assessment; the evaluators felt that any measurable impact was unlikely. It is not surprising that this project was not recycled.

In the public schools the project continued in the second year in the same 25 schools; there were improvements, particularly in the area of curriculum content. Four-fifths of the classroom teachers saw some improvement in children's communication skills; but they felt that classes were too large, instruction was too infrequent, and was not properly geared to the age and intellectual ability of each class.

Although the evaluators were less critical of the operation of the project in the public schools they noted problems, and recommended clarification of goals, training for specialist personnel, and demonstration lessons for classroom teachers. The evaluators suggested that when the number of trained personnel is limited, services should be concentrated on fewer schools, grades, or classes.

CLINICAL SPEECH THERAPY COMPONENT

Under Title I a Clinical Speech Therapy project was offered for the first time to children attending nonpublic schools. The project was recycled for each of the years under study. In the Summer 1967, speech clinics were opened to nonpublic children as well as public school children. The Summer Speech Therapy Clinics and the Clinical Speech Therapy projects were designed to diagnose and treat clinically those children with speech defects conspicuous enough to be emotionally and educationally handicapping. Children who had similar speech defects, whether stuttering, voice disorders, lisping, lalling, or other articulatory defects resulting from cleft palates or cerebral palsy, were treated in groups of no more than 10 pupils. Problems occurred in selecting the target children, largely because of ineffective screening procedures and reliance on referrals by classroom teachers, who often lacked experience and training. As an alternative selection procedure, the evaluators recommended that a speech teacher individually screen every child in grades 3 through 7. Although this would be a lengthy and expensive procedure, it would result in service to those most in need.

Most of the children in the evaluation sample studied had received therapy in one half-hour session per week. The evaluators felt that the children needed at least two half-hour sessions per week. The average caseload in the 1966-67 year was 200, 50 above the national average; the eval-

uators concluded that the speech clinicians' caseload was too large and the amount of individual therapy too brief for effectiveness. One recommendation made earlier was implemented on a small scale in 1967-68; regional centers, for intensive and individualized therapy, were established in those poverty areas of the City where schools did not enroll enough needy children to justify an inschool project. These regional centers may point the direction for the future organization of these types of activities.

Pupil progress was difficult to assess. The first-year Clinical Speech Therapy project was too short to evaluate, and in 1966-67 the evaluators, entering the picture late, found little in the way of pretherapy records. Those records that did exist lacked accuracy and completeness. In general, the problems of record-keeping were immense; each year evaluators noted the need for better records. They also recommended securing taped speech samples before and after exposure to the program. Furthermore, the development of appropriate test instruments was considered essential since there are no standardized methods for assessing change.

The evaluators noted a 16 percent discharge rate, which they compared with a national average of 30 percent. The 1967-68 report states that while project results could not be assessed with certainty, there was ample evidence that a substantial number of children benefited; and the report on the six-week summer project indicated that 56 percent of the sample children were judged to have made progress, 27 percent to exhibit no change, and 17 percent to have regressed. The evaluators attributed the benefits to the quality of the therapy, which they described as excellent and which held the interest of the younger children.

A comparison of the Basic Speech Improvement project and the Clinical Speech Therapy project illustrates the care that must be taken in defining project goals. In the former project, the personnel were uncertain about what they were to accomplish, and there was difficulty in designating target classes and in developing and implementing appropriate instructional strategies. In the Clinical Speech Therapy project the goals and the target population were more identifiable. This project, however, served more children than should have been accommodated in the light of the level of resources available; as a result, more children were treated less intensively than the severity of their need warranted.

CHAPTER XI

GUIDANCE PROGRAMS

George Weinberg

The Guidance Programs area includes projects that emphasize guidance and counseling for pupils with social and emotional problems of varying intensity. In this chapter we shall examine those projects in which guidance is the major focus, although many projects classified elsewhere included assignments of guidance and counseling personnel or of clinical teams. More Effective Schools and College Discovery and Development, for example, offered intensive guidance services, while the plans for the Improved Services and Compensatory Education projects also assigned additional guidance personnel.

The guidance projects are subdivided into three components: Guidance Centers for children attending nonpublic schools: Special Schooling for the socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed; and Institutional Schools for the neglected, deprived, and delinquent. Table XI-1 on the following page summarizes for each project the amount of money budgeted and the proportion spent. The great variability in the percentage of expenditures from component to component reflects the severe shortages of trained licensed guidance and clinical personnel.

GUIDANCE CENTERS COMPONENT

This component includes one project designed for nonpublic school children, which was initiated in the first year of Title I, and which has been recycled each year with modifications in the proposal. A comparatively large amount of space is devoted to the discussion of this project because it typifies many of the problems running through all Title I projects for children attending nonpublic schools, and in addition calls attention to problems in providing similar services to public school children.

The Guidance Centers project (also called Out-of-School Guidance and Evening Guidance) offered to pupils in the eligible nonpublic schools guidance and clinical services similar to services available for pupils attending public schools. Personnel for the Guidance Centers -- guidance counselors and the clinical teams of social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists -- were to be recruited, licensed, and supervised by the Board of Education. The project proposal included plans for a training program in mental health concepts for the teachers in the nonpublic schools, and also a series of orientation sessions for center staffs to familiarize them with the educational philosophy and practices of the nonpublic schools.

The start of the project in the first year was delayed because of the controversy concerning federal aid to nonpublic schools. The location of

TABLE XI-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR GUIDANCE PROGRAMS
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

COMPONENT AND PROJECTS	SCHOOL YEAR 1965-66 and Summer '66 Amount Budgeted	1965-66 and Summer '66 Percent Expended	1966-67 and Summer '67 Amount Budgeted	1966-67 and Summer '67 Percent Expended	1967-68 and Summer '68[b] Amount Budgeted
GUIDANCE CENTERS	606	37	3,225	52	662
Evening	606	37	2,261	62	
Inschool			964	28	662
SPECIAL SCHOOLING	2,529	70	3,379	86	1,618[c]
Regular Schools	2,529	70	744	92	-
"600" Schools			2,635	84	1,618[c]
INSTITUTIONS					
Institutional Schools	223	13	594	61	527
MISCELLANEOUS	-	-	27	128	-
"Teacher-Moms"	2	82	-	-	-
Attendance Services	-	-	27	128	-
TOTAL	$3,360	60%	$7,224	69%	$2,807

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]The Summer 1968 project funded under the State Urban Education Program.

services was particularly at issue. The nonpublic school administrators and teachers wanted the services on the nonpublic school premises; they objected to placing the centers in public school buildings. Many of the first-year problems can be attributed to the centers' inconvenient location and hours (6 P.M. to 9 P.M.) For example, communication between the centers and the nonpublic schools was poor. Pupil records were often unavailable to center staff, and the center staff was unable to observe children in their regular school setting. Referrals from the schools to the centers and from the centers to other social agencies were difficult because of the differences in hours of operation. Space was a problem, as was the delivery of supplies and materials. Many nonpublic school parents were reluctant to send their pupils to the evening centers which were often located in run-down neighborhoods.

The project was recycled in 1966-67 with an important modification: centers could be located in nonpublic school buildings during the day, and in public school buildings in the evening. Although this change helped resolve some of the communication problems encountered in the first year, other problems continued, and new ones emerged.

Again the program started late. There were serious delays in delivery of equipment and supplies. The center staffs continued to be uncertain about the philosophy of the project, and believed that they were not sufficiently knowledgeable about the educational practices of the nonpublic schools. Moreover, all personnel felt that communication, although better than in the prior year was still unsatisfactory.

Perhaps the most serious problem in the Guidance Centers project, the recruitment of staff, was exaggerated by the inauguration of services in the day schools. For the evening centers, staff were recruited from among Board of Education personnel working in the public schools. For the nonpublic school day projects, reliance had to be placed on personnel who were retired or on leave, or on others who worked part time in social service agencies. As a consequence, only about one-sixth of the proposed full-time day positions were filled.

The day guidance center personnel felt that assigning each counselor or social worker to a number of schools -- at times as many as ten -- made them less effective. They felt that their impact was lessened as a result of this fragmentation, and that they had no opportunity to get to know the children, teachers, parents, or school community.

During the 1967-68 school year the evening centers were continued during the spring term only. The day school services continued in much the same fashion as previously. Recruitment of day staff guidance counselors improved somewhat, but the shortage at social workers and psychologists continued; only one psychologist was recruited in 1967-68. Again the project started late; the delivery of supplies and materials continued to be a problem; Center personnel continued to need more supervision and more workshop sessions with the staff of the nonpublic schools. The

evaluators of the project noted that there was some improvement in the relationship between guidance counselors and teachers and parents. They also indicated that the social workers and community agencies' staffs were working together better than they had previously.

What should have been a minor administrative problem remained a persistent and annoying one in the Guidance Centers project. The professional staff needed space to work in, privacy for conducting interviews, file cabinets for records, and telephones for contacting parents and other social agencies. Throughout the period under study, all these necessities for efficient operational support came very late, and in some instances never arrived. Neither housing the centers during after school hours in public buildings, nor during the day on nonpublic school premises, has solved these problems.

A more fundamental concern is with the plan to set up a Guidance Centers project in the nonpublic schools which in aims, objectives, and techniques employed was similar to the services normally provided to children in public schools. Prior to Title I, almost none of the nonpublic elementary schools had any guidance or clinical services. The nonpublic school personnel had had little experience with considering pupil misbehavior or poor achievement in relation to mental health concepts, and little familiarity with referring children with emotional or learning problems to professional guidance and clinical personnel.

The decision to organize complete teams to implement the aims of the project may have been an error. As we have indicated, not only was it difficult to staff the teams, but the nonpublic schools may not have been prepared for that approach.

On the other hand, the clinical staff were uncertain whether the centers were to be school-oriented or were to follow the mental health design of clinical-service agencies. Thus the professional clinical staff did not know whether to function as a school guidance team emphasizing learning problems, or as a social service clinic, and did not know whether to limit their efforts to diagnosis and short-term counseling or to involve the children in longer-term therapy. They were further limited by their lack of knowledge of the philosophy and practices of the denominational schools and lack of opportunity to contact and communicate with the teachers and administrators in the nonpublic schools. Throughout the three-year period they felt that the orientation sessions were inadequate and that neither they nor the nonpublic school staffs were properly prepared.

The development of guidance services in the public schools has been gradual, taking place over a 25-year period. The growth of these services was fostered in large measure by teachers' attitudes of acceptance. The early counselors were teachers themselves, who with some special training worked part time in a guidance capacity. They were well known to their colleagues. Fully trained licensed guidance counselors came much later. Still later, the schools added clinical teams of psychologists, social

workers, and psychiatrists to provide services not only for seriously disturbed children but also for normal children with the normal range of difficulties.

It is questionable to us whether it was practicable to attempt to transplant the organized public school system of guidance services developed over a generation into other school systems with a past history of different philosophies of education and different attitudes toward children's learning difficulties. In retrospect, it seems that the Guidance Centers project in the nonpublic schools would have fared better in the early years of Title I had the services initially been located in the nonpublic school during regular school hours, with some provision for a small evening program. A professionally trained counselor should have been assigned to one or two schools only, and should have been able to make referrals to psychologists, social workers, or psychiatrists as needed. With gradual development from the start, a school-oriented guidance program would have helped the nonpublic school teachers to learn, in the natural course of time, their own role in the guidance process, and they would have been able to meet regularly with the counselors. All parents and children would have had a chance to become more familiar with the services. Because of their scarcity, the teams of clinical personnel should have been assigned on a borough-wide basis, housed in central facility and sent to schools on a regular basis, or as needed.

For the future, the Board of Education needs to address the recurrent problem of the scarcity of guidance and clinical personnel for Title I and non-Title I projects. The Board may need to reconsider its licensing requirements, and attempt to make these specialists available to more needy children. Other recruitment methods should also be considered. For example, with the right kind of publicity of the Board of Education could recruit hourly clinical, help rather than continuing to rely on filling full-time positions. A few regular positions may be necessary to assure a smooth program operation, but the major part of the referrals could be handled by hourly personnel.

SPECIAL SCHOOLING COMPONENT

Starting with the 1965-66 school year, Title I was used to expand public school projects for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children who, because of the severity of their problems, were in special classes in regular schools or were in special schools. These children were considered unable to profit from instruction in the regular classes, or were so disruptive in regular classes that they made it difficult for the other children to learn.

Title I funds were used in 1965-66 and 1966-67 to augment the already existing programs for Early Identification Program classes, Junior Guidance classes, Special Guidance classes, and Career Guidance classes, by providing additional personnel to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio. These classes are organized on the basis of age of pupils, diagnosis of their behavioral prob-

lems and suggested method of treatment.

The Early Identification Program was established to identify both gifted children and children with learning problems in kindergarten through third grade. The program provided counseling to children and their parents.

Junior Guidance classes were designed for emotionally disturbed elementary-level children with personal learning difficulties who needed a permissive therapeutic climate. The children were selected by clinical teams, class size was limited to 15, and teachers were selected both for personality traits and their knowledge of special education.

Special Guidance or Citizenship classes were designed for elementary and junior high school pupils who were being considered for suspension. The students were assigned to small classes and taught by teachers selected by the principal.

Career Guidance classes had been established for junior high school pupils who were considered potential dropouts. The existing program sought to motivate them to stay in school, and at the same time to prepare them for jobs if they persisted in their intention to leave school. Title I provided funds for a curriculum revision and for teacher training.

The schools for the Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children ("600" schools), were special schools that had been established for children with behavioral and learning problems so serious that they could not attend regular schools. Title I funds were added to these schools in all three years and in the Summer 1967. In the Summer 1968, the project was funded with State Urban Education Program money.

Title I added classroom teachers and special personnel to these projects. The administrative, teaching, and clinical staffs of the special classes and schools reported improvements in pupils' attitudes and behavior which they attributed to the reduced pupil-teacher and pupil-counselor ratios made possible by Title I. Although it is often difficult to evaluate the effects of Title I in those instances where Title I was used solely to augment the staffs of pre-existing programs, (see chapter on Regular Academic Programs) in these projects, where staff size was small to begin with, it was easier to identify the additional Title I staff and to describe their activities.

It is apparent in the evaluation reports that all too often the additional staff were performing general school-wide functions. For example, the assistants-to-principals added to the Early Identification Program provided services to the entire school. In a number of instances, so few staff were added that no possible effect could be expected. In the Special Guidance project, Title I funded positions for 12 guidance counselors and one social worker to aid teachers in 120 classes. In Career Guidance, Title I added five guidance counselors to improve the program for pupils in 52 junior high schools.

The evaluators noted that the Board of Education's projects for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children in special classes in regular schools or in special schools need so many modifications in program, teacher training, housing, and curriculum that merely adding a few positions could not have any impact. Projects providing intensive involvement with families of maladjusted pupils or specific training programs for teachers would be more appropriate than the attempts to reduce ratios per se.

Or perhaps Title I should be used to fund pilot experimental projects designed to answer some of the fundamental questions concerning the education of the seriously maladjusted -- such as the referral system, the diagnosis and selection of pupils, and the type of treatment. Efforts to revise curricula may be premature if attempted before there are answers to these kinds of questions.

INSTITUTIONAL SCHOOLS COMPONENT

Midway into the 1965-66 school year, Title I funds were allocated to supplement the educational programs for children in four residential institutions for maladjusted or neglected children. Children were placed in the institutions upon remand of the Family Court. Children were assigned to these public and private institutions because their unstable home backgrounds affected their school behavior to a point that made it impossible for them to remain in a normal school setting.

The major objective of the first-year Title I project in the four institutions was directed toward helping these institutions cope with their educational responsibilities. Title I funds were used to intensify and extend already existing educational services -- additional teachers to reduce class size, adaptions in curriculum, remedial instruction in reading and mathematics, and the assistance of guidance counselors and medical teams. The project was recycled in 1966-67 in the same four institutions.

The project was severely handicapped in the first year because of its late start; it was difficult to recruit competent trained guidance and instructional personnel. Materials and supplies did not arrive by the end of the school year, and there was not enough time to modify the curriculum. In the second year the evaluator indicated that there was some improvement, but the severe shortage of space continued; housing needs competed with school needs, and this diminished the potential effectiveness of some of the Title I services. New services were introduced in music, health education, and art; the administrators were relieved of some of their tasks; and new materials and supplies were purchased. The data were not adequate to assess the degree of improvement resulting from these added services.

In the Summer 1967, the project was expanded to include 12 more public and private institutions for neglected, delinquent, and dependent children. Title I funds were used primarily to provide remedial, enrichment, and guidance activities both during the day and after school. Because of the late start, and the inability to recruit and assign enough personnel, services

to children were limited, and not all children were able to participate. Overall, the evaluators and the project staff were favorably impressed with the fact that new and different experiences for pupils were offered.

The project was recycled in the school year 1967-68 in more institutions; a total of 21 public and private institutions were eligible to participate. These institutions were quite varied and unique in orientation, and served children ranging in age from 3 to 21. Some of the institutions had educational facilities, while others did not. The latter group sent the resident children to public schools during the day. The Board of Education ruled that if a child was enrolled in a public school that received Title I funds under another project, that child would not be able to participate in the Title I activities in the institutional setting.

There was no instance in which the full complement of additional positions was filled, and few of the staff that had been recruited had the necessary background or training. Many institutions did not have adequate space and facilities for implementing the Title I project and frequently the Title I activities conflicted with the daily institutional routine. Of paramount importance was the fact that there were not enough guidance counselors or clinical services made available for the children whose major problems were ones of psychological and personal adjustment. Despite the shortages of qualified personnel and facilities, the evaluators and school staffs felt that Title I funds expanded and enriched the educational experiences of the children.

If Title I continues to be used in these very different residential settings, it might be advisable for the central administration to consider more decentralized strategies, modeled after the projects for Pregnant Girls. A decentralized approach would permit the institutions greater flexibility in the use of funds, and might help alleviate some of the space, materials, and personnel problems. In the circumstances under which these institutions operate, there is understandable stress on more flexibility, more individualized programs, more time for planning, and for recruiting and training appropriate personnel.

CHAPTER XII

PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

George Weinberg
Marge Benjamin

Projects for Children with Special Needs provide instruction and psychological support for children with retarded mental development, serious hearing or speech defects, or other handicaps, offering services such as diagnosis, remedial instruction, counseling, parent orientation, and teacher training.

Table XII-1 shows the amount budgeted and the percent expended for these projects for each of the three years. Title I funds were first

TABLE XII-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a] (Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Mentally retarded:					
Schools	-	-	74	98	c
Centers	-	-	28	91	-
Hearing- & Language-Impaired	-	-	79	96	c
Handicapped children	-	-	-	-	96
TOTAL	-	-	$181	96%	$96

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]Funded under State Urban Education Program.

used for these projects in the Summer 1967, with two projects for mentally retarded children -- a school program and a guidance center program -- and one project for the hearing- and language - impaired. These were budgeted at a total of $181,000 of which 96 percent was expended, a higher ratio of expenditure than most Title I programs. The following year, 1967-68, two of the projects were continued with State Urban Education Program funds, and the Center for Mentally Retarded Children was not recycled. In the Spring 1968, a project for Handicapped Children attending nonpublic schools was initiated. There is a real need for these projects. There are more children with these handicaps than could be served with the funds provided.

The projects offered remedial instruction and supportive services to youngsters enrolled in full-year programs, to those about to leave their special schools and enter regular high schools, and to those preparing for employment. Projects were open to nonpublic as well as to public school children. The general objectives of these projects were to develop the residual capacities of the handicapped, to improve their adjustment to school, and to prepare them for vocational experiences. Some provision was made for the parents of these children to participate in workshops.

The Hearing- and Language - Impaired project, in the summer 1967, was conducted for 150 children in a specially equipped school for the deaf and hard of hearing; it provided auditory training for deaf children to age four; instruction for youngsters in kindergarten through the junior high level; and services to youngsters leaving special schools for the deaf to enter regular high schools, which have no facilities for them. The activities for the younger children were judged successful; therapists were well qualified, and all children were equipped with hearing aids. Some positive improvement in skills was noted at the end of the summer for the children in grades K to 9. The evaluators judged the activities, for those students entering high schools, effective for the hard-of-hearing, but unrealistic for the deaf. The evaluators questioned the possible worth of a six-week experience for these deaf children.

In the same Summer, 1967, one School for Mentally Retarded Children was opened. This project extended the academic year, and for the first time some mentally retarded children were to receive a full year of instruction. The children were to be drawn from many boroughs, but because of bus transportation problems, the project was underenrolled. Much staff time that could have been spent in remedial instruction was devoted to diagnosis of pupils' problems. Another aspect of this project, the recruitment and training of potential teachers for the mentally retarded, was only partially successful in terms of trainees' anticipations. Parents participation in workshops was judged as fair.

The third 1967 summer project, Centers for Mentally Retarded Children and their parents, was established to provide counseling services, day and evening. Those centers where there was continuity, either through

records or personnel, with the regular school year activities provided the best program, but this was not realized ofter enough. Inadequate early planning, late allocation of funds, and ineffective publicity resulted in uneven operation among the centers, and service to only an estimated 20 percent of the targeted population.

In the Spring 1968 a project for Handicapped Children attending non-public schools offered remedial reading, speech correction, guidance, and psychological services to children with mental retardation, visual limitations, and hearing difficulties. Parent conferences were also a feature of this project. Pedagogical personnel included part-time graduate students and retired licensees, who were cited for their dedication but needed more supervision. The evaluators judged inadequate the materials, supplies, and space available to carry out individualized and small group instruction. Despite these and other difficulties, including the need for diagnostic tests and followup studies, the evaluators recommended recycling of these essential services on a full-year basis.

Projects for Children with Special Needs have been initiated with Title I funds on a small-scale basis and greatly need expansion to serve all the needy children. Title VI of the ESEA now provides funds for handicapped children, and the Council Against Poverty has given top priority to services for these children.

CHAPTER XIII

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Judith A. Eisler

Enactment of ESEA created a sudden need for additional classroom teachers, subject area specialists, and clinical support personnel to staff the many Title I projects. The scarcity of qualified personnel was further exacerbated by the need to staff Title I activities in the nonpublic schools. In an attempt to fill the additional positions necessitated by the new projects, school administrators often had to reassign classroom teachers to assume specialist roles for which they had little or no training or expertise.

The majority of Title I project descriptions contain some statement expressing the need to orient or retain the professional instructional staff. The project descriptions for both More Effective Schools and the Expanded Kindergarten project, for example, included a plan for an intensive inservice training program for teachers. In other projects, such as Evening Guidance, there were to be workshops and conferences for school staff. In numerous other instances the project coordinator or supervisor was to be used to train project teachers. In some instances, however, no provision either in released time or funds was made for training.

Since the inception of Title I, the New York City Board of Education has set aside only a small proportion of its total funds for special, discrete projects aimed solely at attracting and training teaching personnel. These projects, which in conception and funding are distinguishable from similar activities within projects, are the primary focus of this discussion of Title I teacher training activities.

There were three major components[1]: Programs to Meet the Need for Additional Personnel; General Teacher Training Institutes; and Curriculum Development and Teacher Training Programs.

Table XIII-1 summarizes the funds budgeted and the percentage expended on these training projects for the years 1965 through 1968. Only during 1965-66 were projects budgeted at more than one million dollars. The trend appears to be moving away from funding, under Title I, teacher training activities as separately planned and executed projects. Many projects, including Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT), the Summer 1968 Recruitment and Training of Spanish Speaking Teachers, and New Directions in Teacher Training, have been funded by the New York State

---

[1]There was an additional model, Teacher Training for One-School Projects, which includes the School-University Teacher Education Center (SUTEC), a Title I and Title IV joint activity.

TABLE XIII-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
COMPONENT AND PROJECT	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL:	3,048	66	391	91	-
ITTP	1,152	84	369	54	-
Demonstration Training	168	50	-	-	-
TV and AV	1,728	56	22	710	-
GENERAL TRAINING					
Training Institutes	2,205	79	739	73	258
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	697	52	182	105	-
Middle Schools	567	56	-	-	-
Career Guidance	67	47	182	105	-
SMED	63	30	-	-	-
MISCELLANEOUS:	141	27	509	67	195
SUTEC	141	27	401	62	195
Internship Principals	-	-	108	87	-
TOTAL	$6,091	68%	$1,820	78%	$453

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.

Urban Education program. Other teacher training projects have been funded with district decentralized Title I funds; in 1967-68, there were 25 separate district teacher training proposals which do not appear in the table.

PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL

In response to a severe shortage of qualified teachers, the Board of Education instituted several projects to recruit and train additional teachers. In the Spring and Summer 1966 the Board and The City College of New York jointly undertook the Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP) project, a preservice program of recruiting, screening, and training liberal arts graduates with baccaluareate degrees in areas other than education. Participants who completed the program received college credit in education. Some follow-up activities for the graduates were scheduled for the 1966-67 school year.[2] The Demonstration Teacher Training program was also instituted for the teachers who were to work in the Remedial and Tutorial and the Educational Enrichment projects in nonpublic schools. They received training, for which they received stipends, in music, art, health education, library, and speech improvement. A TV and AV project was implemented in 1965-66 and in 1966-67 for both public and nonpublic schools. In addition to providing TV and AV equipment, the project trained teachers to give pupils more varied visual and auditory experiences.

The basic objective of ITTP was to provide a general pool of trained teaching personnel so that public and nonpublic schools would have the additional teachers required to implement a variety of Title I projects.

The ITTP recruited and accepted approximately 3,400 liberal arts graduates, of whom more than 1,800 completed the six-week summer session and received a conditional substitute license. More than 1,700 accepted the assignment offered for the 1966-67 school year. By May 1967, one year later, approximately 1,520 were still teaching.

Unfortunately, the project was hastily conceived and fresh recruits were placed in school situations for which they had not received appropriate or adequate training. For example, in some instances ITTP graduates were assigned to the nonpublic schools as subject area specialists, and in other cases, to Special Service schools. In neither instance, were these ITTP graduates particularly equipped with the special skills needed to function in these situations. The Demonstration Teacher Training project suffered from a similar weakness; the Board's training specialists were generally not familiar with the backgrounds of nonpublic school teachers, nor with the resources and facilities of the nonpublic schools.

---

[2]In 1967-68, ITTP was continued in an expanded and modified format with City tax levy funds.

In the following school year, the ITTP graduates reported that the nature of the assignments was a major weakness of the project. Furthermore, they criticized the project for its failure to provide them with student teaching experience, and for presenting an unrealistic, idealized image of teaching.

The administrators of the schools to which the graduates were assigned compared the ITTP graduates favorably with other new teacher education graduates. However, without some additional evidence of the actual classroom performance of ITTP graduates and compared with that of other new teacher education graduates, the administrators' comments have little significance.

GENERAL TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTES

The most general objective of the Institute programs was to provide teachers, especially new and inexperienced teachers, with insight into the needs of the disadvantaged child and training in meeting these needs. Patterned after the traditional National Defense Education Act summer training institutes, these Title I institutes offered the trainees inservice credit or stipends. Recycled each year, the institutes changed in organizational form and content, but attendance remained voluntary.

In the Summer of 1966 a centrally planned and executed project was conducted in ten centers for teachers, supervisors, and administrators from both public and nonpublic schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods. In each center four courses of two week's duration over an eight week period were given. The courses were the same in all ten centers. Approximately 3,300 participated, most of whom took from two to four of the two week offerings.

The following summer, under a new arrangement, another cycle of general training institutes was begun. The Teacher Training and Reading Institutes project was mandated for poverty-area districts but the actual program was decentralized -- placed under district supervision. Each district was free to design the format and objectives of its institutes, within the guidelines for decentralized projects provided by the Board of Education. Nineteen districts conducted institutes in the Summer 1967 for the full grade range of teachers; the other eligible districts chose instead to conduct institutes at the beginning of the 1967-68 school year. Institutes differed in such factors as organization; degree of supervision; level of district support; quality of instructional staff, guest speakers, and materials; and in the granting of credits or stipends.

The third cycle of training institutes was started in February 1968; 23 of the 26 eligible districts conducted institutes using mandated decentralized funds. Approximately 2,000 teachers, mostly new and inexperienced, were enrolled. In the absence of a central directive, each district was free to decide whether to grant stipends or credit to the participants. This district autonomy often resulted in confusion and dissatisfaction on the part of teacher-trainees.

The major training techniques consisted of lectures and demonstration lessons conducted by project trainers and guest speakers. No practice teaching opportunities were afforded the participants and no demonstrations were conducted with children. Participants raised some questions about the expertise of the trainers and lecturers, and reported that the lectures were generally too theoretical. By the third cycle there was some indication that the lecturers and trainers were more qualified and expert.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING

Three training projects were proposed in the first year; one for the personnel of the Middle Schools project, the second for the personnel of the Career Guidance project, and the third for teachers in special schools for socially maladjusted or emotionally disturbed children (Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed project.)[3] The major purpose of these projects was to train teachers and other personnel to develop and use new instructional materials. Training sessions were planned for the staff that were to be involved in a specific project.

With minor exceptions most new curricular materials were not available in time for the training sessions. Thus it was not possible to incorporate into the curricula suggestions from the staff that were to be involved; the Middle Schools'materials, when finally available, were not rated highly; the evaluators reported that the materials were developed without feedback from the teachers and that the curriculum was not appropriate for children in this age group. The evaluators also questioned the innovativeness and appropriateness of the Career Guidance project curriculum and expressed concern with the absence of a philosophy based on the nature and needs of children in such classes. The major shortcoming of the curriculum for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed students was the absence of sufficient psychological sensitivity to the emotional impact of the content.

In general, the development of new curricula did not fare well. The guides did not incorporate techniques or suggestions for handling students' problems. The evaluators felt that successful implementation of the curricular materials would depend too much on the skills of particular classroom teachers. While a curriculum guide should be flexible enough to permit teachers to be creative, it should be sufficiently structured so that it can be used by inexperienced or less creative teachers.

The training sessions generally attracted a full complement of teachers. However, because attendance was voluntary, there is no information as to whether the training reached all the staff who were to be involved in implementing

---

[3]In later years, the training and curriculum aspects of these projects became more integrated into the total project design, and for this report are grouped in the appropriate Program area chapters.

the projects the following fall. In some instances, training for a project that was to begin in September was scheduled for the end of the previous school year. Assignments for the fall had not been made, and, therefore, the training included teachers who were not later assigned to schools in the projects, and left out others whose assignment would be to the project schools. To include as many eventual participants as possible, training for a particular project should be held in September, before the start of school and after teaching assignments have been made and accepted. This procedure of course, would be applicable only in situations where teachers need little training. Where more time is needed, the summer months could be used.

GENERAL CONCERNS

The trend in Title I in New York City has been to include provision for teacher training and retraining in the design for a specific project. Some of the problems in training professional instructional staff have been described above. Other issues, common to separate teacher training activities as well as to training within a project still need to be examined.

To acknowledge that poor children are the victims and not the causes of the conditions of poverty under which they live suggests a need to critically reexamine those systems and institutions concerned with helping these children to escape from the bonds of poverty. For the most part the educational system has not helped these children to overcome the pernicious effects of poverty on their educational achievement.

An examination of Title I teacher training programs to date indicates their irrelevancy to the needs of teachers struggling to understand and teach poor children. While it is true that these children often come to school without the requisite skills for successfully meeting the schools demands, the teacher training projects have not been directed toward building on those perceptual and cognitive strengths these children do possess. Most teacher training activities have not focused on changing teachers' attitudes and expectations, nor have they provided teachers with specific techniques for working with deprived children.

If, as much of the research indicates, teachers' attitudes toward the educability of the children they teach are positively correlated with their students' actual achievement, it seems especially important that teachers' attitudes toward deprived children's potential for academic growth be an important consideration in the philosophy of training programs. Serious question can thus be raised about how much the training programs as presently conceived can help change the academic performance of economically deprived children.

Equally important are the criteria and methods used to recruit and select trainers and teacher trainees. Recruitment and training projects which attract volunteers, do not necessarily reach those who would be most likely

to profit from the training experience. One of the major weaknesses of the Title I teacher training activities is the lack of any systematic attempt either to select trainees or to assign those who have received training on the basis of individual abilities. As a result, teachers often find themselves teaching in areas for which they are not specifically trained, in which they have little expertise, or in situations where their attitudes are not consistent with the objectives of the project. If, for example, a project must recruit teachers to implement a new experimental program or approach, some attempt should be made to identify and select teachers who have the inclination for innovation.

Teachers should be assigned to projects on the basis of their demonstrated success in achieving the objectives of those projects. It is patently absurd, for example, to assign teachers who have not been successful in teaching reading to staff afterschool centers designed to improve reading achievement. Where highly qualified personnel are not available, people must be trained to perform effectively in relation to specific project goals. Otherwise "more of the same" prevails and the children continue to meet with failure.

What is less apparent, perhaps, is the significance of the underlying philosophy for both pre-and inservice teacher training programs. The evaluator of the summer Teacher Training Institutes, comments:

> "The way in which the supposedly disadvantaged children are viewed will clearly determine the kind of 'solution' being sought. Thus, if the cause for failure is preceived as being within them, the emphasis will be on programs that are designed to change them.
>
> If, on the other hand, the educational system is recognized as having a major part in the failure, then, hopefully, the search will be on for ways in which to change the system . . . ."[4]

The calibre of the trainers is one of the most, if not the most important aspect of any teacher training program. Any program will be only as good as the quality of the people responsible for the training. As the evaluator of the Teacher Training and Reading Institutes project comments:

> "The sole criterion for the choice of a trainer should be how skilled this person is in working with disadvantaged children and how effectively he can communicate these skills to other teachers."[5]

---

[4]M. Sylvester King, Summer Teacher Training Institutes in Poverty Areas in New York City, Center for Urban Education, May 1968.

[5]Marvin H. Gewirtz, Teacher Training and Reading Institutes, Center for Urban Education, October 1968.

Unfortunately, this standard has not always been achieved in Title I teacher training programs. It is speculative whether this failure can be attributed to a greater emphasis being placed on the trainers' formal qualifications than on their demonstrated teaching ability, or to the shortage of qualified trainers due to the late start of the Title I programs and competition for staff from non-Title I programs, or to the absence of a sufficient number of highly qualified trainers.

In order to provide the best teacher trainers to the largest possible number of trainees, it has been recommended that a centralized teaching cadre of highly capably trainers, expert both in their area of specialty and in the art of teaching, be made available to the districts on a roving basis. As more and more Title I activities become decentralized, and if qualified trainers are not distributed evenly across districts, such a cadre may become increasingly necessary.

Evaluators have repeatedly concluded that the format and organization of training programs are crucial to their success. A variety of training techniques have been employed in Title I teacher training programs, including lectures, small discussion groups, demonstration lessons, and workshops. No one format has been identified as the most successful, but it is clear that those providing an opportunity for considerable trainee participation are of greater value than those in which teachers are simply "talked at." Teachers have repeatedly asked for more practical training including workshops with children, specifically related to the real-life situations they face, rather than theoretical lectures which for the most part do not help them in their classrooms.

Another recurring organizational problem has been the inclusion within one training session or workshop of teachers of different grades or subject areas with varying interests and experience. Evaluators have repeatedly recommended that efforts be made to group trainees on the basis of the grade taught, or on the basis of experience or subject matter area, to make it possible to focus on teachers' specific problems.

There have been occasions where trainees have returned to their home schools only to find it difficult or impossible to implement what they have learned at an institute because the attitudes and approaches of their supervisors conflict with those presented at the training sessions. Efforts should at least be made to coordinate the Title I teacher training programs with other ongoing training activities or supervision taking place at the teacher's home school. An alternate suggestion would be to group together teachers and supervisors from the same school to help ensure continuity between training experiences and actual classroom activities. This would allow for continued feedback and interaction among people who may face similar problems and who have an opportunity to cooperatively seek their resolution. No training program, no matter how good, is ultimately of any educational value to children unless it is translated into action in the classroom and unless there is opportunity for continual feedback and exchange among those directly involved in the educational process.

Another issue is that of remuneration for teacher trainees. Typically, stipends or inservice credit have been given to teachers simply for their attendance at training programs. It could be argued that it is incumbent upon professionals to make efforts toward their own growth, and that in-service credit or money ought not to be awarded for such efforts. If, however, teachers are to continue to receive credit or stipends for these activities, it would seem necessary to establish techniques for screening out those whose primary interest is financial, and to develop methods for assessing mastery of training program goals. We are arguing for the establishment of qualifications for trainees that go beyond subject or grade taught, and which might include attitudes toward children, and the capacity for self-criticism. Although neither such criteria nor means are currently available, some effort should be made to establish and develop them.

Year after year, in report after report, almost without exception, it has been stated that we need more teachers, more training, retraining, orientation, or supervision. So widespread is the problem that it is most likely beyond the scope of Title I and properly the responsibility of the teacher education colleges and universities. The primary responsibility to prepare innercity teachers would seem to lie with the teacher training institutions.

Serious question can be raised about the use of Title I money for general teacher training activities. There are other sources of funds, both federal and local, specifically earmarked for this type of training. Perhaps Title I funds to be used for teacher training should be limited to financing training activities specifically related to implementing the objectives of Title I projects. In those projects involving innovative approaches, such as the employment of paraprofessionals or nontraditional systems of classroom organization, specific and intensive training is called for. To continue to staff Title I projects with personnel who are not trained to implement them is to perpetuate programs that fail to improve the achievement of children. Perhaps more money should be invested in the training of personnel before implementing large scale projects.

To date, the evaluations of Title I teacher training projects have, largely because of budgetary considerations and time pressures, assessed short-term effects. The evaluations have relied on questionnaires and interviews with trainees, trainers, and school administrators, and observations of training sessions. They have thus been limited to reporting the beliefs and opinions of those involved. A more crucial test of the effectiveness of teacher training should include an investigation of whether the teacher-trainees, as a result of the training, are more knowledgeable and skillful, and whether the teachers demonstrated changes in their classroom performance.

One small followup investigation was conducted.[6] Allowing for selection problems and sampling limitations, the data from the study suggested that some changes in attitudes of teachers participating in the training institutes were reflected in the classroom observations; participants were more flexible and optimistic than nonparticipants. The teachers look for concrete training programs, realizing that there is a "great difference between knowing a principle and knowing how to put that principle into practice."

---

[6]Rita Senf, Followup Study of 1966 Summer Institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children, Center for Urban Education, October 1967.

Clearly there is a great need for additional followup studies of this kind. Observations of training sessions and reports by participants have provided many valuable suggestions for modifying the format and content of the training activities. However, the ultimate test of the effectiveness of any teacher training program is whether there are positive changes in pupils as a result of changes in teacner performance.

CHAPTER XIV

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I

Marge Benjamin

Judith A. Eisler

Title I legislation was enacted at a time when the leaders of poverty communities were actively beginning to express their frustration with traditional social welfare policy, which gives the poor no voice in decisions vitally affecting them. The communities were pressing for more local initiative and involvement in the decision-making process in housing, employment, public assistance, and education. Title I seemed to offer a mechanism for taking such a role in educational matters.

The underlying assumption of this push for involvement is that poor people have a legitimate role to play in interpreting the needs of their children to the professionals. On the one hand, parents and other community residents place the blame for their children's academic failure on what they preceive as an instransigent and remote school bureaucracy. On the other hand, many school personnel view the problem as the failure of the home environment of poor children to offer adequate preparation for the school situation. It is not yet clear whether it would be more effective and appropriate to try to change the school's methodologies or to try to alter the child's out-of-school life experiences. In an attempt to bridge the gap between the home and the school, New York City has used Title I funds in a variety of ways to involve parents in a cooperative effort with the schools.

This chapter examines the opportunity provided by Title I of the ESEA for community people to participate in various levels of educational developments. It includes a discussion of the involvement of individual parents qua parents, the role of parents as paraprofessionals in the school system, the inclusion of community members on school advisory boards, and the community action agency role in the overall planning and execution of programs as mandated under the ESEA. Much of the data for this chapter is based on Title I community involvement activities that were conceived and funded as separate or discrete projects. Table XIV-1 summarizes the costs of these separately planned and funded activities for parents and paraprofessionals, and includes the Title I District Decentralized budget for activities in which the local communities have had some say.

Many other Title I projects, described in the program chapters of this report, also sought to involve parents; these include More Effective Schools, Open Enrollment, P129, Strengthened Early Childhood, and the

TABLE XIV-1

FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED, FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
PROGRAMS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Parent Activities:					
Followup in 13 Schools	-	-	64	62	-
Parent Involvement	-	-	-	-	c
Homework Helper	-	-	-	-	d
Paraprofessionals:					
Aides for Libraries	-	-	193	66	-
K Pilot in Two Districts	-	-	246	81	-
Auxiliary Aides	-	-	-	-	677
District Decentralized:					
Regular Year	-	-	-	-	11,555
Summer	-	-	$1,496	75%	$4,641

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]The Parent Involvement budget is included in the Strengthened Early Childhood budget (See Early Childhood Program chapter.)
[d]The 1967-68 Homework Helper at Two Bridges project budget is included in the 1967-68 CAB.

corrective projects for children attending nonpublic schools. In general, in these projects there were varying and often disappointing degrees of planning, organizing, and coordinating the efforts aimed at recruiting and training parent and paraprofessional participants. In this chapter some of these projects, or aspects of them will be discussed again in relation to their effectiveness in involving community residents in Title I.

PARENT ACTIVITIES

Individual parents had in the past been asked to assist in the education of their children. The Parent Followup Project in 13 Schools in 1966-67 provided a program of workshops for parents of former Head Start children who were then in kindergarten or the first grade. During the Spring 1968, Parent Involvement was initiated as one of the parts of the Strengthened Early Childhood project, designed to improve education for poverty area children from kindergarten through second grade. The Parent Involvement project was the largest effort to actively involve parents in the educational process.

The rationale for an early childhood program was that the earlier in a child's education that learning opportunities and supplementary and/or remedial instruction are provided, the less likely he is to encounter academic problems. The thrust of the Strengthened Early Childhood project was to improve the children's reading ability, since reading as presently perceived is the foundation for learning. It was felt that parents could play an active and significant role in realizing this objective. The underlying assumption of the Parent Involvement aspect of the Strengthened Early Childhood project was that if the language activities of the school become part of the child's home experience, there will be less disparity between his home life and his school life, and he will do better in school.

This program was mandated by the Board of Education for poverty area schools in 26 districts. Each district was given a fixed sum of money, and some leeway in implementing the program objectives so as to best meet its own local needs. If the districts so chose, they could augment the program by using additional money from the district decentralized Title I funds available to them. It was anticipated that the program would involve approximately 36,000 parents.

Although the project involved only approximately 20,000 parents, and some districts put forth little effort to implement the program, the evaluation of the project indicated enthusiastic endorsement of it. The evaluator felt that the project demonstrated positive impact on parents' attitudes toward the school and toward their children; it increased parental participation in children's school activities; it dis-

sipated feelings of inadequacy many parents had about their role in their children's education; and it improved communication and co-operation between parents and the school. Moreover, parents expressed the opinion that their children were doing better in school. There was no attempt to assess actual changes in pupil achievement because it seemed unrealistic to expect measurable changes during the short period -- five months -- of the program's operation.

The evaluation sought to identify the reasons for the program's different impacts on the attitudes and behavior of parents of children in the participating schools. Both the recruitment of parents and the nature of the parent training were identified as crucial and relevant to the success of any parent program, and therefore will be discussed at some length.

"A program's success was highly dependent on the extent to which attempts were made to reach out into the community, a function usually assumed by the paraprofessional."[1] Less personal methods such as posters in the school or flyers sent home with the children, were generally not effective in informing or recruiting parents for the workshops. More intensive efforts, such as visits to parents in their homes, posters in local stores, announcements at church, and the personal relationship established between parents and paraprofessionals, proved to be more effective mechanisms for enlisting parental participation. The amount of personal effort expended to reach and involve parents, and the degree of genuine interest and commitment demonstrated by such effort, seemed to make a difference in the degree of parent involvement and cooperative effort.

There was also a "noticable correlation between those programs that were well planned, varied, and well presented, and the size of the workshop group."[2] Characteristics of the best attended workshops included cohesive, nontechnical presentations replete with concrete examples; the opportunity for parents to actually construct learning materials; materials and books that parents could take home; the chance for parents to experience some of the same lessons that their children had in school; and demonstrations of various teaching techniques with children present. Clearly, these workshops furnished parents with specific, well organized, practical information, first hand, real life experiences, and the tools with which to carry out what they had learned. These parents received explicit, organized training that provided them with the what and the how of helping their children to acquire basic reading skills, plus the wherewithal to do so.

---

[1]Marvin H. Gewirtz, Parental Involvement in a Reading Improvement Program, Center for Urban Education, November 1968.

[2]Ibid.

Other hallmarks of successful programs noted by the evaluator included extensive and continuing district supervision and support; cooperation and participation of the school administrators; translations for non-English-speaking parents; and home visits by paraprofessionals to parents who were unable to attend school workshops, to teach them ways to help their children.

Home visits in particular reflect recognition of the very real problems faced by many poor people; many parents cannot afford to spend time at the school. The enthusiasm with which parents accepted home visits bears witness to the fact that many who are not active at the school are nevertheless concerned about and eager to play a meaningful role in their children's education, especially if their involvement is actively sought.

PARAPROFESSIONALS

Another, more innovative use of community people has been the employment of paraprofessionals in education. Most are community residents, often parents, who work in the schools to augment the efforts of the professional staff, serving in a variety of capacities, furnishing classroom assistance, school-home liaison, clerical support, and library services. Moreover, employment of paraprofessionals provides tangible economic benefits to the professionally unskilled. In the school year 1967-68 there were approximately 10,000 trained paraprofessionals used in a large number of Title I projects. This figure has remained fairly constant for Title I.

Paraprofessionals have a variety of educational qualifications and experience. All are hired on an hourly basis and are entitled to fringe benefits, such as sick leave, vacation pay, holiday pay, and health insurance. There are two primary categories of paraprofessionals: aide, for which no high school diploma is required; and assistant, for those with a high school diploma or up to two years of college. The following chart briefly summarizes titles, salary, and requirements:[3]

Title	Hourly Salary	Educational Requirements
AUXILIARY SPECIALIST Auxiliary Trainer Parent Program Assistant	$3.50	H.S. diploma or equivalency, and prior experience and training in an approved program.
ASSISTANT Family Assistant Educational Assistant	$2.25-2.50	H.S. diploma or equivalency, and some prior experience and training.
AIDE School Aide Teacher Aide Family Worker	$1.75	Elementary school graduation or equivalency.

[3]Adapted from ESEA Guidelines for Decentralized District Programs, OSFAP, New York City Board of Education, March 1968.

In some instances, projects employing paraprofessionals provided career-oriented and higher educational opportunities for them through the Career Ladder Development Agency of the Human Resources Administration and The City University of New York. The Career Ladder Development Agency provides tuition and texts for those paraprofessionals enrolled in college. In 1967-68, there were 900 paraprofessionals involved in the Career Ladder program, taking six college credits a semester. At present, nine credits are allowed.

Two of the major formats used in the Parent Involvement project, cited above, included active and responsible roles for paraprofessionals. Some districts adopted the already discussed home-visit program for which the paraprofessionals were typically given one week's preparation devoted to training and feedback. Other districts offered parent workshops conducted by paraprofessionals. In these workshops, the paraprofessional had primary responsibility for the selection of topics and speakers, although the school's supervisory and teaching staffs were available for any assistance they might provide. Paraprofessionals often established personal relationships that helped to bridge the gap between the school and the community, and provided real insights into the problems facing the children. The evaluators of the Parent Involvement project concluded: "Our overall impression of the paraprofessionals involved in the program is that they are an able and serious-minded group of people who, given proper training and supervision, are capable of making a meaningful contribution to the educational system."[4] This program was discontinued as a mandated decentralized program in the anticipation that it would be incorporated into other decentralized programs.

The evaluators of projects employing paraprofessionals have almost unanimously concluded that the use of paraprofessionals holds vast potential for having a significant positive impact on the education of disadvantaged children. They point repeatedly, however, to the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities to be assumed by aides, the lack of explicit goals or plans for purposeful training, and the lack of cooperative planning with teachers for the effective use of paraprofessionals. Many of the programs are also criticized for their failure to specify the criteria or methods to be employed in the selection or recruitment of the paraprofessional.

The lack of clearly defined objectives or specific plans for the utilization of paraprofessionals is documented in the evaluation of the Educational Careers Program, Auxiliary Aides, which was conducted in the New York City public schools during the 1967-68 school year. The project provided auxiliary personnel in kindergarten classes in poverty-area communities.[5] Two of the objectives stated in the project description were

---

[4] Gewirtz, op. cit.

[5] Inez L. Smith, et al. An Evaluation of a Program for the Recruitment, Training, and Employment of Auxiliary Nonprofessional Neighborhood Personnel for Careers in the New York City Schools. Center for Field Research and School Services, School of Education, New York University, December 1968.

to liberate teachers from a wide range of noninstructional tasks, and to allow teachers more opportunities for experimentation and innovation. Observations of kindergarten classrooms indicated that with the advent of paraprofessional personnel, teachers performed fewer noninstructional tasks, and there was a greater frequency of small group teaching. There was no evidence that teachers were more experimental or innovative. In view of this latter finding, it is not clear what specific merits are to be derived from freeing teachers from noninstructional tasks, unless some effort is made to retain them to use the time more innovatively.

In general, the program planners failed to think through their goals and the methods for achieving them, or to provide the opportunity for teachers and paraprofessionals to plan cooperatively. No assistant in this program reported attending any planned inservice training with teachers. Some teachers did not even know that they were scheduled to receive assistants in the near future -- further testimony to the lack of organization, planning, and program coordination.

Overall, the findings of these programs do indicate that paraprofessionals can be a valuable resource, and in roles other than monitorial or clerical. Paraprofessionals have engaged in supportive interpersonal relationships with children, on both instructional and noninstructional levels. Moreover, they have served as a link between the school and the community, thereby helping to lay the foundation for future cooperative relationships. And, not least, they appear able to involve parents with the schools.

The use of paraprofessionals in the New York City school system is essentially an experimental effort. There is considerable evidence of its capacity for positive influence on the education of poor children. If, however, the full potential of paraprofessional assistants is to be realized, it is clear that their intended role must be restated in specific behavioral terms; and the functions, roles, and responsibilities of both the paraprofessional and the teacher must be clearly defined and communicated. Specific methods for recruitment and criteria for the selection of paraprofessionals must be established; a comprehensive training program directly related to the realization of specific program goals must be planned and implemented; teachers must be trained in the effective use of paraprofessional assistants; and paraprofessionals themselves need additional training. In summary, we feel that a cooperative program of planning and coordination involving school administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals must be established as an ongoing process.

Notably missing from the evaluation of projects employing paraprofessionals is an assessment of their reactions to and perceptions of the projects. In most other evaluations the perceptions of the project and school staff are systematically assessed and reported. Since paraprofessionals' perceptions may reflect those of the community at large, it is important to include their feelings and opinions as additional evaluative information.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON SCHOOL ADVISORY BOARDS

Another new experimental departure in New York City's Title I program involves the participation of community residents in advisory roles bearing on policy formulation in specific schools. Members of the local community served on advisory committees in two of the more than one hundred centralized Title I projects. In neither project was any budgetary provision made for their activities.

In the Academic Excellence in an Inner-City Elementary School: P129 project, the pupil's selected one parent and one community leader as representatives on a governing board which also included a representative of the local school board, the District Superintendent, the principal, and the coordinator and director of the project.[6] This governing board was to help establish educational goals and standards for evaluating the program services offered by Yeshiva University, and was to plan and approve budgetary allocations and expenditures. The evaluator found that "the governing board governed relatively little," not fulfilling its intended role. "It was a delegated offshoot of the local school board and without operational autonomy." It operated without laws or rules for its own procedures, and was dominated by the project director from Yeshiva University. Thus, as a decentralized experience for local community residents, the "governing board probably exposed its members to a condition of nondecentralization, if anything."[7]

In another project, the Benjamin Franklin Cluster program, an advisory group known as the Franklin Improvement Program Committee (FIPC) represented a wide spectrum of community organizations in East Harlem, where the school is located. The group was not established as a governing board, had no prestated objectives, but was to function as an organization of school, university, and community representatives interested in the improvement of Benjamin Franklin High School.[8] The FIPC made substantial contributions to ongoing school operations. They raised and acted on issues such as the school's serious narcotics problem and police security; they liberalized student-government procedures; and they proposed new programs such as teacher training and a reading program for parents. They were also actively concerned with planning and followup of this new Benjamin Franklin Cluster project, teacher recruitment programs, and the plans for Benjamin Franklin's conversion to a comprehensive high school.

---

[6]The chapter on Regular Academic Programs contained a fuller discussion of this project.

[7]Nathan Kravetz, Academic Excellence in an Inner-City Elementary School: P129. Center for Urban Education, October 1968.

[8]This project is discussed in the chapter on Motivational Academic Programs.

The FIPC had a greater impact than the governing board of P129, but it had no opportunity to show how effective it could be in dealing with potentially greater conflict situations. The limited experience of these two advisory groups strongly suggests that without clear role definition and real authority, community members school advisory boards may not make substantive contributions to the decision-making process.

As the City moves toward decentralization of the school system, more local residents will participate in advisory capacities to the schools. This will have political as well as educational consequences, as local residents strive to have a greater voice in decisions that affect their children. One of the significant problems will be to determine who represents the many voices of the community and to establish a mechanism whereby differences of opinion and adequate representation of the varying view can be resolved.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

The fourth area of community participation in Title I is the only one specifically mandated by law. Section 205(a)(7) of PL 89-10 calls for cooperation in program development between local educational agencies and community action agencies, approved under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This specification was written into the law to ensure that programs of both agencies would complement and supplement each other, to avoid competition, waste, and duplication of effort. It was further amplified in the federal Guidelines, which stated that "Cooperation here means continuous and genuine working relationships during the period when programs are being planned and developed, as well as when they are being carried out."[9]

According to the federal Guidelines, evidence of this cooperation may be provided in several ways: there may be respresentatives of the local community action agency on planning and advisory committees during the planning, development, and operating stages; there may be a procedure for continuous review and discussion of plans and operations between the LEA and the community action agency; the community action agency may indicate by letter submitted to the SED that it has worked cooperatively with the LEA to develop projects and that it will continue to do so during the life of the program; the LEA may submit evidence that it has tried to enlist the cooperation of the community action agency from the outset of the planning stage; or a representative of the LEA may serve on the board of the community action agency.

This mandate for community participation was only partially realized in the first three years of Title I and was fraught with confusion about the intent of the law. In 1965-66 there was no procedure for the

---

[9] Italics ours.

realization of this cooperation. In the Summer 1966, a formal agreement was reached between the Board of Education and the New York City Council Against Poverty (CAP) specifying that the latter would serve as the coordinating agent for the local community action agencies, and would review all proposals for Title I initiated by the Board.

A series of circumstances kept CAP from having a substantive role in 1966-67. The original Council was dissolved as part of a restructuring of its parent organization, the Human Resources Administration of New York City. Moreover, for that year CAP had received only fragmentary project proposals from the Board. The agreement finally reached was that the new Council would neither approve nor disapprove any of the 1966-67 Title I programs. Such a stand was largely necessitated by the fact that there was as yet no group within CAP to review programs.

An Education Committee was formed in the Spring 1967, but it had an unfruitful relationship with the Board, largely because of its own problems. The circumstances were further complicated by the committee members' distrust of the Board of Education. Committee members felt that they were merely being asked to rubber stamp final proposals and had no mechanism by which to participate in the planning. To change the direction the Board of Education was taking, and to counter their own feelings of impotency, CAP developed a set of priorities for the use of Title I funds. The Board adopted these priorities, modifying them to fit its programs. For example, CAP placed priority on a more relevant reading program for the early childhood grades. The Board's response was the vast Strengthened Early Childhood project. This project was not how CAP envisioned the fulfillment of any early childhood priority, because it had no provision for changes in curricular content or for retraining teachers to work with paraprofessionals of with individual children. A few projects have been originated by request of CAP -- training of Spanish-speaking Teachers[10] and projects for Pregnant Girls -- but no sizable citywide program has developed out of CAP suggestions.

Any illusions the community held that CAP had a further role in developing centralized Title I programs was dispelled by the Superintendent of Schools when, at a Spring 1967 public meeting to amend the Board's annual expense budget (including all Title I funds), he made it clear that he felt it within his jurisdiction to "organize the schools" for the following fall (including Title I programs) before consultation with CAP.[11] Such organization of the schools is tantamount

---

[10] Originally planned for Title I, this project which began in the Summer 1968, was funded under the New York State Urban Education Program. In 1968-69 it was shifted back to Title I.

[11] David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street, New York: Random House, 1968.

to assignment of personnel and specific programs for a full school year.

The first breakthrough in opportunities for community participation in planning Title I projects came when, largely in anticipation of a restive summer, approximately $1.5 million of Title I funds were decentralized for Summer 1967 projects. This money was secured from accruals. (See Table XIV-1 for the funds that were budgeted for District Decentralized projects.) Project proposals were hurriedly assembled; 78 projects in 27 districts were planned covering three main areas -- remediation, enrichment, and training of teachers and paraprofessionals. The evaluation for the Summer 1967 noted that all the decentralized projects needed more advance planning time to notify parents and children, to organize staff, and to order materials.

Once the precedent for decentralization of Title I funds had been set, community groups built up pressure for more extensive decentralization of the money anticipated for the school year 1967-68. In August 1967, the CAP asked for $30 million in district decentralized Title I funds; they also asked for impartial program evaluations, additional funds for paraprofessionals, and greater efforts to recruit Spanish-speaking teachers.

The following month, the Board stated that a more localized mechanism would be established for developing District Decentralized activities, whereby local community action agencies' approval was to be sought by district superintendents. If agreement was not reached at the local level, the Board of Education and the CAP would confer. The Board also stated, however, that all proposals were subject to review by the Superintendent of Schools; such review seemed to some community members to negate their contribution and participation.

During the Summer 1967 additional staff was finally assigned to the Education Committee of CAP to help develop decentralized proposals. They suggested model programs. The Education Action Division urged all poverty districts to form local education committees to meet with district superintendents. Negotiations between these local education committees and district school officials were often protracted and bogged down on a number of issues. Some local community groups wanted the right to screen paraprofessional personnel for Title I programs; some believed erroneously that they had veto power over the use of funds. Since funds were decentralized, some local community action agencies wanted to change central review by CAP to local review; this would mean that each local community agency rather than CAP would be the official community action agency for Title I.

In November 1967 the Board of Education and CAP issued a joint statement noting that district superintendents were not required by law to consult community groups on the choice of professional personnel, but that they might do so if they wished, and that ". . . all Title I programs must be operated and controlled by the Board of Education."[12] All in-

---

[12] Joint Statement of the New York City Board of Education and the New York City Council Against Poverty, November 28, 1967 (Mimeographed).

terested community groups might submit proposals, and although the community action agencies might record their response to each project, no veto power was implied. The more militant community groups felt that this joint statement was a sellout. Board personnel felt that the activities of the Education Action Division in encouraging local autonomy were confusing and misleading, and in direct contradiction to the agreement of the joint statement.

Community action agencies continued to feel that their recommendations were not being followed. They asserted that the programs and budgets they submitted were substantially changed by the Board; the Board asserted that most changes were made at the district level and were largely insignificant. The conflict went on. The Education Action Division petitioned both state and federal departments of education; the SED did not acknowledge the need for arbitration.

Five poverty areas where the confrontation with the district office was most acute refused to sign letters agreeing to Board of Education proposals.[13] Meanwhile, the school year was well under way and decentralized projects had not yet begun. Operation of decentralized Title I projects began in the Spring 1968, without regard to the poverty agencies' refusal to sign letters. The $11.6 million decentralized budget covered 356 locally-initiated projects.[14] These projects included a wide range of educational approaches, only a small number of which were considered innovative by the evaluator. Most were continuations of projects already in existence.

The pattern of community participation in planning these projects varied. In one community studied, a local review board, composed of representatives of the community, the local school board, and the district superintendent's office, screened projects before making recommendations to the district superintendent in another district, characterized by far less community involvement, no review board existed. Instead, the entire interested community discussed at an open meeting proposals that originated with and were recommended by the district superintendent.

The evaluation of the 1967-68 Decentralized projects noted the lack of adequate time in which to develop final proposal plans despite the fact that district superintendents had been notified in the Summer 1967 of the estimated forthcoming District Decentralized allocations for 1967-68. Final notification of the allocation was presented in a memorandum dated November 2, 1967. As we have indicated, the projects started in the Spring 1968; thus there was more than a six-month lapse between the time allocation estimates were known and projects were begun.

---

[13] These were Brownsville, Williamsburg, Crown Heights, Morrisania, and the Lower East Side.

[14] In addition, nearly $2 million was budgeted for certain mandated special projects, in which a centralized allocation was to be matched by a like sum from the district's decentralized funds. There was some community resentment at being given decentralized funds, but then being told how they were to be spent.

Apparently a great deal of time was consumed in negotiations between community agencies and district superintendents.

This first sizable experience in the administration of decentralized funds revealed great variations in the ability of district superintendents and community action agencies to work together. The district superintendents were not accustomed to the power given to them by the availability of the discretionary funds; some succeeded, others failed in their new role. The community action agencies were often split among themselves and differed widely according to the Board in their interpretation of their educational objectives and their ability to negotiate for their demands. Moreover, they attempted to operate against a powerful local and central bureaucracy with long-established methods for defusing community pressures. Members of the community agencies reported more unresolved disagreements between them and the district office than school officials reported between them and the community agencies. In some communities it was felt that the Board personnel capitalized on the internal fractionation.

The evaluation reported that community participation ". . . produces more projects that involve parents and indigenous community residents and more projects that stress education innovations. . . . The degree of conflict was greatest [in those districts] where there were more innovations and where there was a greater demand for community involvement."[15]

While none of the 356 projects was evaluated as to its effectiveness or outcomes, several procedural recommendations were made by the evaluation team. Again the evaluators noted that more planning time is needed; differences between the Board of Education's guidelines for District Decentralized proposals and the CAP guidelines must be resolved;[16] more effective mechanisms must be developed to involve community representatives in all phases of program development, operation, and evaluation; red tape imposed by the central staff should be eliminated from decentralized administrative processes; and community groups should seek a wider spectrum of community opinion and develop more harmonious working relationships among themselves.

The greatest innovation brought about by the initial decentralization of Title I funds was the delegation of administrative authority, setting the stage for making a traditionally remote system more responsive to local needs. The initial attempts with decentralization provided the first real experience for district superintendents in handling their

---

[15]Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., District Decentralized Title I ESEA Programs. Center for Urban Education, December 1968.

[16]Prior to the start of the 1967-68 school year the Education Action Division of CAP issued a set of guidelines for local community action agencies. The Board's guidelines were issued after the projects had begun.

own funds, learning to make accommodations with face-to-face community pressures, and learning how to select among program options, which were often political at the core. For community representatives, this experience was an opportunity to test how far the district superintendents were willing to go to negotiate with them on local objectives, an opportunity to refine their own techniques for dealing with the power structure, and some opportunity to develop substantive projects. As the evaluation notes, the results of negotiations were varied and many problems were left unresolved, but the future significance of these experiments in autonomy should not be underestimated.

A new round of Decentralized activities began in the Summer 1968. The amount budgeted for such programs was $4.6 million, and 215 district proposals were funded. As in the prior school year there was great emphasis on traditional academic programs, and less emphasis on innovative efforts. The largest number of projects, approximately one-third, were in the area of language arts, reading, and mathematics. These were followed in frequency by programs in performing arts, recreation, and enrichment. Only six percent were classified as experimental.

The evaluation was limited to a questionnaire assessing the opinions of project directors.[17] As in former cycles, the project directors noted a lack of planning time, excessive red tape, and administrative problems. The evaluators recommended recruiting more Negro and Puerto Rican project directors and using pre- and post-test data, or logs and reports, in future evaluations Although much use was made of paraprofessionals (volunteers and recruitment aides), the evaluation noted a need for greater community involvement in planning, operation, and evaluation of projects.[18] It is apparent that at least through the Summer 1968, the great potential for local community participation had not been realized even in those projects specifically designed for the purpose.

Part of the problem lies in what poor people see as obduracy of the educational establishment. They see the resistance to change forcing them to take an aggressive stand in demanding educational reform. They see no safeguards and no recourse. The wording of the law led people to believe that they had powers they could not, in fact, exercise. Although cooperation is written into the law, the local mechanisms developed to provide such cooperation are defective, often precluding real involvement. There are no procedures to create a legitimate body of community representatives; thus, as in the first cycles, district superintendents can select which voices in the community they will heed. The

---

[17] In the Summer 1969, to improve upon the evaluations of Decentralized programs, an attempt was made to study the decentralized programs of five districts in greater depth.

[18] The Pratt Center for Community Improvement evaluated certain projects in detail; they reported that in some instances the local community action agencies had not approved the project proposals.

role of the community action agencies and the Council Against Poverty is greatly in need of clarification in order to realize the great potential of local participation in the education process.

In this chapter we examined the role of community people in Title I programs; this runs the gamut from personal involvement as the parent of a particular child, to representation on a political, decision-making level. None of these functions has as yet been fully developed in Title I. Unclear role definition, absence of specific training, inadequate methods of selection and recruitment, and unsatisfactory mechanisms for the exercise of political power have typified community involvement in New York City. It is clear that the potential for effective community participation exists, but it will not be realized unless the present inadequacies are redressed.

CHAPTER XV

TITLE I IN THE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Marge Benjamin

The provision of instructional services to private schools under the ESEA was an unprecedented step in American education. Records of floor debate in the House and Senate indicate the sensitive nature of this issue. The ESEA climaxed years of concern by nonpublic school administrators that their children share the funds that were to be available under the new federal education law. Section 205(a)(2) of the law states that the state educational agency will assign funds to the local educational agency only after it has determined that " . . . to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements . . . in which such children can participate." The law goes on to state that the funds and property allocated to private schools are owned and are to be administered by the public agency, the Board of Education in New York City.

The total number of children attending both religious and secular private schools in New York City, as reported by the New York State Education Department for the Fall 1968, was 448,778.[1] According to the Board of Education's 1966-67 application for federal assistance, 10 percent of all poor children in New York City eligible for Title I projects were attending religiously affiliated nonpublic schools.[2] To date, no secular private school has been certified eligible under Title I requirements.

In June 1965, after passage of the ESEA but prior to the allocation of funds to school districts, the New York City Superintendent of Schools formed a Standing Committee of officials representing the denominational schools in the City -- among them the Roman Catholic Dioceses of New York and Brooklyn, the Hebrew Day Schools, and the Lutheran, Episcopal, and Greek Orthodox schools. Catholic school children account for approximately 85 percent of all the Title I-eligible nonpublic school children in New

---

[1]New York State Education Department, Survey of Nonpublic Schools, New York State, 1968-69, p.5.

[2]Board of Education, OSFAP, ESEA Title I, School Year 1966-67, Application for Federal Assistance Part 1, Basic Data (OE 4304), Section 6. Approximately 32 percent of all public school children are eligible for free lunch; more than 45 percent of the nonpublic school children in poverty areas are eligible for free lunch.

York City.[3]

This action of the Superintendent of Schools represented the first real ongoing contact between public and nonpublic school officials. Moreover, this was the first time any association of all sectarian nonpublic schools had been formed in New York City. The group has remained in existence to the present, and has extended its interests beyond ESEA. The Standing Committee was formed to advise the Superintendent of Schools, and to suggest programs and activities that would meet the needs of the poor children attending nonpublic schools; there was no parrallel advisory group for the public school program. From the very beginning the Standing Committee met biweekly to discuss the kinds of services nonpublic schools would like to receive under Title I.

Meanwhile, the Board of Education had delegated the implementation of ESEA to the Superintendent of Schools. The United Parents Association protested this delegation of authority that gave the Superintendent carte blanche powers with respect to nonpublic school programs. The United Parents Association maintained that programming in the nonpublic schools was a power that should have been reserved by the Board. The Board's resolution was nevertheless passed.

It was not until the end of March 1966, more than midway into the first Title I school year, that the Superintendent made public the proposals for nonpublic school projects. These first year proposals were the source of much discussion at public meetings and raised almost all the major issues that continue to surround the participation of nonpublic school children in Title I activities. Many of the issues are still unresolved. However, the decisions made the first year have set a precedent for the future.

In this chapter we will discuss four of these major issues; eligibility of nonpublic school children; the amount of funds allocated; the sites of services; and the kinds of nonpublic school services permitted by law.

ELIGIBLLITY OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

In the first year, criteria for eligibility of all schools were very imprecise, and there were no set policies for selecting target schools and children. Spokesmen from nonpublic schools and civic organizations pressed for clarification, for a formula to apply to all schools and children. With respect to nonpublic schools in particular, civic groups pointed out that the mere fact of a school's location in a poverty area should not qualify it for service, since, they maintained, nonpublic schools drew their pupils from a wider geographic area. In 1965-66, 184 nonpublic schools

---

[3]Personal Communication, OSFAP, liaison officers to the nonpublic schools.

were selected to participate in Title I projects.

By the second year of Title I, the eligibility issue was still unresolved, although the redefining of poverty areas by The Council Against Poverty to include pockets of poverty within more affluent areas enabled the Board to provide services for children in a larger number of nonpublic schools. A total of 217 nonpublic schools were selected to participate. In testimony before the Board of Education in August 1966, a spokesman for the New York Civil Liberties Union noted that although the Board had asked for statistics on the numbers of educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools, the Board had not yet announced a definition of educational deprivation, nor had they made public the statistics on eligible children in the nonpublic schools. He concluded that the existence of such statistics was unlikely, and thus that the procedures for allocating funds to the nonpublic schools were "legally dubious and administratively haphazard."[4] The nonpublic school administrators had been asked to sign forms, similar to those used for the public schools, verifying the numbers of children eligible to receive free lunch. Civic group representatives questioned the validity of these forms; so did the nonpublic school representatives, who felt that their forms were more carefully scrutinized than those for the public schools and that the criterion for free lunch was more liberal in the public schools. Moreover, some denominations had other difficulties with the free lunch criterion because of dietary laws.

By the 1967-68 school year if 30 percent of the population of a school was eligible for free lunch, the school was eligible for Title I services. The 30 percent figure was protested by the Standing Committee who wanted it reduced to 10 percent to reflect the total percentage of poor nonpublic school children citywide. Employment of the 30 percent criterion in 1967-68 led to the selection of 194 nonpublic schools.[5]

Subsequently, academic equivalents of free lunch were adopted, and the present formula takes both poverty and academic retardation into consideration. Starting with the 1968-69 school year, the criteria for eligibility state that for pupils attending both public and nonpublic schools, both within and outside poverty areas, eligibility will be granted if half or more of the pupils live in poverty areas, and if at least 30 percent are eligible for free lunch or if their academic retardation parallels that of pupils in schools with at least 30 percent free lunch eligibility. (For a more detailed discussion of eligibility requirements, see chapter on Population.)

---

[4]New York Civil Liberties Union. Testimony of George R. LaNoue before the Board of Education of the City of New York, August 17, 1966 (mimeographed).

[5]Heller, op. cit.

For the future, the Standing Committee is very much concerned with how the nonpublic schools will fare under decentralization of the City's public educational system. This is the one area where the different denominations may not be in accord. Of the several types of denominational schools eligible for Title I assistance, only the Roman Catholic schools' attendance areas roughly parallel those of the public schools, since they are organized on a parish or neighborhood basis. The other much smaller nonpublic school systems draw their students from wider geographical areas. One of these systems, the Hebrew Day Schools, is urging central administration of Title I funds to ensure that all children will be served. The Catholic school administrators, on the other hand, are in favor of decentralization of Title I funds, but are also concerned that their children may not be included in Title I projects designed on a district basis.

The Standing Committee's official position is that participation of nonpublic schools should vary by district according to the actual proportion of poor nonpublic school children in that district; that is, on the average, the proportion of nonpublic school children to all school children participating in Title I projects should reflect the total percentage of eligible nonpublic school children citywide. The Committee has asked that "guarantees concerning comparable participation in federally assisted programs . . . be incorporated into a decentralized proposal that will eventually have the force of law."[6] One way to facilitate this would be to include the number of eligible nonpublic school children in computing the district allotment of decentralized Title I funds.

TITLE I FUNDS FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Another early area of concern was with the amount of Title I money allocated for services to nonpublic school children. Table XV-1 on the following page shows the total funds allocated to programs designed exclusively for the participation of nonpublic school children;[7] and the funds for projects designed for joint public and nonpublic school participation. Figures for the projects for public school children are included for comparison.

---

[6] Committee of Nonpublic School Officials of the City of New York. Statement of Concerns in Regard to Orderly Continuation of Services to Children in Nonpublic Schools Under Proposed Decentralization Plan. January 22, 1969 (mimeographed). Since their suggestions were not incorporated into the decentralization plan, the problem remains of how to establish appropriate mechanisms for allocating funds to districts so as to ensure services for nonpublic school children as mandated by law.

[7] The breakdown of projects into categories of public school, nonpublic school, and joint public and nonpublic school projects developed for Part I of this study (Heller, op. cit.) has been used in this chapter and in this report when appropriate.

TABLE XV-1

TITLE I FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR PROJECTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN, NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN, AND JOINT PROJECTS 1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
PROJECTS	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Nonpublic School Children	3,522	41	3,404	64	2,877
Joint Participation	18,531	75	21,801	91	21,450
Public School Children	44,879	73	50,171	90	49,371
TOTAL	$66,932	72%	$75,376	89%	$73,698

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.

The present position of the Standing Committee is that the allocation of funds for nonpublic school children should reflect the total number of deprived nonpublic school children in the City, since these children are included in the entitlement formula. According to the Chairman, the SED's figures indicate that 14 percent of educationally disadvantaged children in New York City attend nonpublic schools.[8]

For the first two years approximately 5 percent of the total Title I program budget was allotted for projects exclusively for nonpublic school

[8]Statement made by the Standing Committee of Nonpublic School Officials before the New York City Board of Education hearing on Title I ESEA proposals, August 28, 1969.

children; for the third year, based on tentative figures, the percentage was slightly lower. These percentages are exclusive of the central administration budget (CAB), part of which is for salaries of liaison personnel who coordinate and administer nonpublic school projects; inclusion of this proportion of the CAB would raise the allocation of funds for nonpublic school children.

There are a significant number of projects in which both public and nonpublic school children participate, including all preschool projects, most summer school projects, and projects for pregnant girls, students with special needs, and the neglected and delinquent, speech-impaired, mentally retarded, hearing-impaired, and socially maladjusted. In addition, there are literally hundreds of decentralized projects, in many of which nonpublic children could participate. The Board estimates a 10 percent nonpublic school enrollment in the summer District Decentralized projects, reflecting their estimate of the citywide percentage of the deprived children who attend nonpublic schools. Exact figures are not available on the number of nonpublic school participants in these joint projects, although the nonpublic school officials feel that the percentage has been increasing slowly.[9] If children attending nonpublic school actually make up 10 percent of the enrollment in the joint projects then 10 percent of the costs of these projects can be counted as having benefited nonpublic school children. Using 10 percent as an estimate, an additional $1.9 million could be added to the total nonpublic school project budget in 1965-66, and $2.2 million in 1966-67, with approximately the same amount in 1967-68.

The amount of funds budgeted for projects for nonpublic school children presents only part of the story. While 72 percent of the total 1965-66 Title I budget was expended, only 41 percent of the budget for project exclusively for nonpublic school children was expended. Moreover, of the total Title I funds expended, the proportion spent for project exclusively for nonpublic school children approximately 3 percent. These figures reflect both the late start of the nonpublic school projects in 1965-66, and the subsequent difficulties involved in securing sufficient numbers of licensed Board of Education personnel to staff them. In 1966-67, the last year for which expenditure figures were available, a larger proportion of the available funds were expended; 64 percent of the budget for projects nonpublic school children was expended, as compared with 89 percent of the Total Title I budget.

SITES FOR SERVICES

Another area of concern is sites, that is, where the Title I services to nonpublic school children are to be provided. Although Section 205 (a) (2) of the ESEA suggests that nonpublic school children might attend public schools part-time during the day, such dual enrollment was ruled out by the New York State Attorney General as contrary to state law. He maintained

---

[9]For the 1969-70 District Decentralized projects, Fordham University is conducting a study of nonpublic school pupils' participation which should provide a more exact and up-to-date estimate.

that this arrangement would entail commingling of state and federal funds, with the result that state funds might go to nonpublic schools, which is contrary to the State Constitutions. The Standing Committee held that conducting programs on nonpublic school premises was not only consistent with Congressional debate, but was the only sound educational principle. Other groups were opposed, maintaining that programs should utilize public premises wherever possible to allow children from public and nonpublic schools to rub shoulders and foster integration.

In 1965-66, projects were instituted on both nonpublic and public schools premises. Originally the afterschool centers for nonpublic school children were to be held in public schools and utilized by both public and nonpublic school participants, but many public school principals interpreted a central Board directive to mean that the afterschool centers were for nonpublic school children only. Later the Board formed separate centers for the two groups. The administrators of the Hebrew Day Schools complained that afterschool religious instruction precluded attendance of their children at the centers, and some parents of nonpublic school children did not wish their children to attend the centers. By the time these issues were clarified the school year was over. In 1966-67 the afterschool program for both public and nonpublic school children was established in 120 public and in five nonpublic schools.

According to Board of Education policy, for a school that meets the eligibility requirements to receive Title I assistance, there must be a sufficient concentration of eligible pupils so that the installation of a project is warranted. Nonpublic schools do not always have enough pupils to justify installing a project. The Board has tried to accommodate these children by establishing centers at which services will be provided. A recent investigation of nonpublic schools' participation in Title I, conducted by a Boston College team, suggested another resolution: ". . . in nonpublic schools, identified as eligible, but where there are too few students to justify the assignment of a Title I teacher . . . neighboring nonpublic schools [should] be paired. Eligible children need not be deprived because of the [size of the] school they attend."[10] However, it would not be equitable if the same policy were not applied to public schools with insufficient concentrations of eligible children.

KINDS OF SERVICES

What kinds of services -- projects -- can be provided to nonpublic school children? According to the federal Guidelines, "only special services and arrangements of a therapeutic, health, remedial, welfare, guidance,

---

[10]Vincent C. Nuccio, et al. A Study of the Participation of Nonpublic School Children in Title I, ESEA Programs and Services in New York City (Submitted to the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York), Boston College, October 1968.

counseling, or similar nature may be provided on private school premises and then only when such services or arrangements are not normally provided by a private school."

The first year's proposals for projects for nonpublic school children included the purchase of equipment (such as television sets and other audiovisual equipment), remedial reading, speech, and guidance services. There were to be afterschool centers offering art, music, health education, and library instruction, in addition to remedial and tutorial centers in reading and mathematics. Teacher training workshops and demonstrations for nonpublic school personnel, including stipends for participants, were also planned.

Many civic groups protested these plans. The New York Civil Liberties Union said that inclusion of activities other than remediation, speech, and guidance was outside the limits set by law, but both the Standing Committee and the Board of Education held these activities to be therapeutic. The United Parents Association protested that the ratios of teachers to children eligible for the guidance projects and the corrective projects favored the nonpublic school children; as a result, these ratios were subsequently adjusted to be more in line with the teacher-pupil ratios in the public schools. Other concerned citizens maintained that sufficient numbers of personnel would not be available to staff the projects, which, especially in the guidance projects, proved to be the case.

In the first year especially it was difficult to find enough staff to fully implement the nonpublic school projects. The law prohibits the paying of salaries of nonpublic school personnel directly. To staff the daytime projects, licensed Board of Education personnel are assigned to the nonpublic schools, but during the first three years of Title I, no Board of Education teacher was assigned full time to one nonpublic school; many did actually work full time by being assigned to more than one school. A nonpublic school in which there were enough children to justify a full-time load was assigned more than one teacher. These policies were subsequently changed.

Many newly licensed Intensive Teacher Training Programs graduates of the 1966 Summer program were used in the 1966-67 school year as specialists; 90 percent of the Corrective Reading teachers in 1966-67 were graduates of the Intensive Teacher Training Program. The Boston Study Team (cited earlier) noted that some nonpublic school officials fear that these Intensive Teacher Training Program graduates, now with several years of teaching experience, will have to transfer to public school assignments in order to qualify for their permanent licenses.

Table XV-2 on the following page lists the projects for children attending nonpublic schools and summarizes the funds budgeted and expended for the years under discussion. All these figures have previously appeared in the tables in the Program chapters, since the projects for children attending nonpublic schools, similarly to the projects for children attending public

TABLE XV-2
TITLE I FUNDS BUDGETED AND PROPORTION EXPENDED FOR PROJECTS EXCLUSIVELY FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN BY PROJECT
1965-66 to 1967-68, EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAB[a]
(Funds in Thousands)

	SCHOOL YEAR				
	1965-66 and Summer '66		1966-67 and Summer '67		1967-68 and Summer '68[b]
PROJECT	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted	Percent Expended	Amount Budgeted
Corrective Reading	476	39	886	88	914
Basic Speech Improvement	45	22	-	-	-
Speech Therapy	133	46	222	71	210
Educational Enrichment	1,832	40	-	-	-
Demonstration and TT Workshops	168	50	-	-	-
Remedial and Tutorial Centers	262	51	c	c	-
Guidance Centers	606	37	964	28	662
Corrective Mathematics	-	-	926	64	724
Bus Trips	-	-	112	51	107
Achievement Tests	-	-	88	50	63
Institutions for Neglected	-	-	184	57	c
TV and AV Training	-	-	22	d	-
English-as-a-Second Language	-	-	-	-	101
Handicapped Children	-	-	-	-	96
TOTAL	$3,522	41%	$3,404	64%	$2,877

[a]CAB is the Central Administration Budget.
[b]Final budget figures and expenditures were not available for the 1967-68 school year by the cutoff date for this report.
[c]These projects were expanded for joint participation.
[d]Expenditures included a large amount of money for equipment which was not budgeted that year.

schools, were classified under their major aims. As can be seen in Table XV-2, only two projects in the first year expended half or more of the amount budgeted. First year proposals included large amounts of money for equipment, and for that year of all the money expended for projects for nonpublic school children, approximately one-third of the money was spent for equipment.

In 1966-67 several changes were made. Only two projects from the first year were carried over into the second. The Basic Speech Improvement project was not recycled because it provided whole class instruction, which is not considered within the Guidelines of ESEA. The Demonstration and Teacher Training project, which paid stipends to nonpublic school teachers, was eliminated after protest by civic groups. New programs added in the second year were: Corrective Mathematics, staffed by Intensive Teacher Training Program graduates; Bus Trips to places of cultural and civic interest; an Achievement Test project for several grades to provide information necessary to determine educational criteria of eligibility for Title I; and a TV and AV Training project for teachers. Another project was added offering services to children in Institutions for the Neglected and Delinquent, in accord with the new ESEA amendment. The budget for Corrective Reading almost doubled, while the amount expended more than quadrupled; the increased expenditure resulted in large measure from the increased staff available following the Summer 1966 Intensive Teacher Training Program. Of all the projects in the nonpublic schools, Guidance Centers was the most poorly implemented; less than 30 percent of the budget was expended, because of the inability to hire sufficient members of specialized personnel.

Fewer changes took place between 1966-67 and 1967-68. Most projects were recycled; one was dropped. Services to children in Institutions for the Neglected and Delinquent were expanded to include public school participants. A project for Handicapped Children, and one for those who were learning English-as-a-Second Language were introduced. The total allocation to nonpublic schools was reduced, while the percentage budgeted for projects for both public and nonpublic participants rose slightly.

The nonpublic schools are concerned that discrete projects in reading, mathematics, speech guidance, and so on, are planned with little regard to the possibly disrupting effects of such programming on school organization or on the children. As was pointed out previously, most nonpublic schools participating in one project also participate in all other nonpublic school projects (with obvious exceptions such as Institutions for the Neglected and Delinquent). Moreover, the same children participate in more than one project. For example, an informal study based on a sample of children in the 1966-67 Corrective Mathematics project indicated that approximately one-third of the Corrective Mathematics children were also in Corrective Reading. These children leave the regular classroom to receive each type of corrective instruction; when they return they may have missed important regular classroom work. Since there is a substantial number of such children additional investigation of the number of children, and their needs, is called for. A corrective approach may not be best suited to meeting the needs

of these children.

THE FUTURE

Over the three years under investigation many of the issues with Title I projects for children attending nonpublic schools were considered settled, at least temporarily. For example, both the Standing Committee and the Board of Education have apparently conceded the educational merits of conducting projects on the premises of the nonpublic schools. Moreover, many administrative difficulties have been resolved. More personnel with more experience became available to staff these projects and many of the rules about full time employment and assignments have been changed; the changed policies have generally resulted in smoother operation of the projects and an increasing compatibility between the Board of Education teachers and the teachers in the nonpublic schools.

In some sense the final resolution to the two major problems of services and sites may not lie in the hands of educators but may be in the hands of the courts and the legislators. In December 1966 four civic groups filed suits in the Federal and State Supreme Courts. The suits challenge the use of ESEA funds for nonpublic school children as a violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which guarantees separation of church and state, and of Article 11, Section 3 of the New York State Constitution (the so-called "Blaine Amendment") which prohibits the use of public funds to aid denominational schools.

The Federal Supreme Court ruled that the plaintiffs had standing to sue, and at this time further action is pending. There has been no action on the State Court case since its inception, although the prohibition of public financial aid to sectarian schools became a focal issue at the 1967 New York State Constitutional Convention. The new constitution was defeated at that time, and many believe the defeat was brought about through the efforts of those in favor of retaining the Blaine Amendment. Early in 1970 both houses of the State Legislature voted to repeal the Blaine Amendment. If another session of the Legislature also votes in favor of repeal, the issue will be presented to the State's voters.

With the temporary suspension of these issues, and stimulated by the decentralization of a considerable portion of the Title I funds, the Standing Committee of Nonpublic School Representatives began to raise questions about eligibility and the allocation of money. The Committee's concern is relfected in their appeal to the New York State Commissioner of Education to conduct an investigation of whether the allocation of Title I services to nonpublic school children is commensurate with the total number of such poor children. Only recently, after many requests by the Standing Committee, the Board of Education and the SED have initiated meetings with the Committee to review the question.

They are concerned with the eligibility criteria, which they feel

discriminate against them because the nonpublic schools are not organized on the same basis as the public schools. Some of the nonpublic schools are small and draw their students from a wide geographical area so that they may fail to qualify for eligibility on the basis of residency. Further, the Standing Committee maintains, the size of the smaller nonpublic school systems often means that although a school may qualify for eligibility in terms of the percentage of poor students, the school may not receive services because the actual number of eligible students is too small to justify installing a project. The Standing Committee feels that the services should be allocated to poor nonpublic school children in an amount equal to their total number citywide without the limitation imposed by the requirement of concentrations of such children in a school. But both the Board and the State Education Department hold that while federal funds are allocated on the basis of poverty, it is State policy that Title I services are to be granted to educationally disadvantaged children residing in concentrations of poverty.

Within the next several years the problems faced by the nonpublic school administrators are likely to intensify. The outcomes of the court cases will have implications that will affect the existing arrangements. Decentralization of increasingly larger amounts of Title I funds will contribute to their problems.

The Standing Committee is very uncertain about the future participation of nonpublic school children in decentralized activities; they maintain that participation of these children should vary by district according to their representation in the district. Generally, some mechanisms will be needed so that funds can be transferred from district to district because many of these children may not live in the same district in which the school is located. Furthermore, because we anticipate new questions about the location of services for nonpublic school children under a decentralized arrangement, controls and guarantees will have to be worked out in accord with the needs of the children and with a basis in sound educational practice. At the local level, the district superintendent, the community action agency, and the representatives of the several denominational schools will have to learn to work closely and cooperatively to make certain that all needy children will benefit from the ESEA to the extent to which they are entitled.

CHAPTER XVI

EVALUATION

Unprecedented in American education is the mandate of Title I that the effectiveness of every project and the total program composed of all the LEA's projects be evaluated annually. In order to ensure that Title I funds are used properly and effectively, the LEA, the state education department, the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children all are required to make annual reports on the use of funds and the conduct of programs.

The importance of evaluation in the ESEA of 1965 is emphasized in four different sections of Title I, as well as by the inclusion of Title IV -- the Title to strengthen educational research and training -- in the same Act. Section 205 (a) (5) indicates that the LEA must make certain that "effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children . . ." Section 206 (a) (3) specifies that the State Education Department (SED) will make periodic reports to the U.S. Commissioner of Education evaluating both the effectiveness of payments and the effectiveness of particular projects in improving children's educational attainments. Section 212 (a) established the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children; the National Advisory Council is to make an annual report to the President who, in turn, will transmit the report to the Congress.

This many-tiered evaluating and reporting system is a novel statutory provision, emphasizing the legislators' concern with making the program effective. In stressing objective measurements, baseline data, and before-and-after measures, the ESEA of 1965 seemed to give evaluation importance in policy-making. Despite this apparent concern, Section 207 (b) limited the reimbursable payments for evaluation to <u>one</u> percent of the LEA's annual grant. Moreover, the legislation left to the state agency the format and substance of the LEA's annual reports. Of most importance, perhaps, the Title I legislation failed to provide either mechanisms or sanctions whereby evaluation findings could form the basis for successive program refinement. It was left largely to the judgment of local policy makers whether or not to act on the findings and recommendations.

Before discussing the kinds of evaluations that have been and should have been conducted, and the relationship between evaluations and policy formulation, we will present a brief description of how New York City fulfilled the evaluation requirement of Title I, since the process that was established had both political and educational implications.

EVALUATION IN NEW YORK CITY

In the first year of Title I, the Superintendent of Schools asked the Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Bureau of Educational Research, the Board of Education's internal research division, to take responsibility for all aspects of evaluation and reporting; this responsibility included developing the evaluation designs to be submitted to the SED with the project proposal, conducting the evaluations, and reporting to the SED and the Office of Education as required.

The internal research resources of the Board could not encompass so large a task. It is to the Board's credit that when faced with a choice of expanding their own facilities or contracting evaluations to others, they sought objectivity by contracting with external, independent evaluation agencies. In the first year, the Bureau of Educational Research and the Center for Urban Education conducted the evaluations of all Title I projects. In subsequent years a growing list of other research agencies, both profit - and nonprofit-making, became involved.

Evaluation is the only service an LEA is permitted to subcontract for under the ESEA and a formal contract between the Board of Education and the external evaluation agency must await approval of the project budget by the SED. As a result, these contracts have never been signed until long after the start of the school year, although informal negotiations between the Assistant Superintendent and the evaluation agency usually start with the opening of school. The director of the evaluation meets with the Assistant Superintendent to discuss the plans for the final evaluation design, a modification of the design submitted to the SED. The final design agreed to depends on such factors as the availability of data and the size of the budget. These conferences began in the first year and may include representatives of the Division or Bureau responsible for implementing the project. All tests or other instruments must be approved by the Board prior to their use.

The contract between the Board of Education and the evaluation agency is for the evaluation of a discrete Title I project, with little regard to other projects, whether Title I or the myriad non-Title I projects, that may exist in the same schools or include the same children. Unless the particular investigator is evaluating several projects, he may have no knowledge of what or where the other projects are. In general, the evaluator is provided with little more information than that contained in the particular Title I project proposal, and in those instances where there was a modification in the proposal subsequent to the conference, no systematic procedures have been developed to notify him of it.

These procedures have encouraged each evaluator each year to evaluate a project all over again, as if the previous cycle and evaluation of it did not exist. Each report gives the reader the impression that the project began anew. Part of this problem results from the one-year evaluation

cycle and the fact that a new evaluator may have been contracted for the new cycle. When the new evaluator brings a fresh point of view to the study this becomes a laudable practice; but all too often the new evaluator spends much time and effort in investigating the same things as his predecessor and in much the same fashion. Although a new evaluator may design new and better instruments, in doing so he loses the opportunity for presenting comparative findings. For example, there are reports on recycled projects stating for each of the three years that supplies were late or that the staff needed training, without providing any indication of the degree of improvement over the prior cycle. By permitting the investigator great latitude, the contracting process fails to take advantage of accumulated experiences.

Under the ESEA the Board of Education maintains responsibility for disseminating all evaluation reports. The evaluation agency prepares interim and final reports, and a short summary of the final evaluation report. The interim reporting requirement was first instituted in 1966-67 in response to a state suggestion, since final reports were not completed until after the end of the school year and thus could not provide information for modifying the coming year's program. Moreover, in the three-year period, the final reports have been increasingly more delayed in delivery, partly as a result of the insistence of the Board and the SED on the inclusion of more achievement test results for all projects. The evaluators, in seeking to comply with this request, and without the necessary funds for conducting their own testing, were dependent on the results of the citywide administration of the standardized achievement tests; these tests are administered each year and the results are usually not available until May or June. Because of pupil mobility and record-keeping problems in the City, final samples of pupils cannot be determined until the test results become available, so that pre-and post-comparisons cannot be made until that time. To partially solve this problem, the Board of Education and the SED requested the Summary evaluation report furnished prior to the delivery of the final report. In addition, the agencies themselves have tended to produce and reproduce, more attractive and more formal research documents, reflecting perhaps a competiveness for evaluation funds, as well as the formalization of evaluation as an exercise.

To meet the deadlines imposed by the Title I funding cycle, the interim reports now come out in March or April, in time for making project plans and staffing estimates for the school year beginning in September. Each year the start of the New York City Title I program operation has been delayed -- either because of citywide teachers' strikes, uncertainty about the extent of funding, or delay in state and community approval of project proposals. As a result of the late start interim reports have been based on fewer observations and have been more general than was anticipated, although they provide the Board with more information than would have been available to it otherwise.

THE ROLE OF EVALUATION

In the past, more educational research was written for a restricted audience, namely, other researchers or research-minded educators who were familiar with research methodology and terminology. Title I brought new audiences into being. Educators, school board members, politicians, parents, teachers, and the larger community all have a stake in this new educational venture, and need different kinds of information concerning the effectiveness of projects: parents need to know about their child's school; teachers need to know if what they are doing is working; local school boards need information on which to base staffing and other management decisions; and educational policy makers and legislators need information that will permit them to improve projects and make funding allocations. It seems reasonable to assume that evaluation was mandated to help the local educational agencies improve the quality of education for disadvantaged children. Part of the problem with the established process is that it has proved extremely difficult to make one evaluation, no matter how excellent a study it is, serve all these different purposes.

In the absence of specific mechanisms obligating an LEA to consider evaluation findings, and since the SED was not made responsible for determining whether evaluation results were considered in an LEA's subsequent plans for recycling the project, the impact of evaluation was determined in large measure by the attitudes and policies of the LEA's program planners. While it is beyond the scope of this report to systematically investigate the role of Title I evaluations on Title I policy in New York City we will examine some of the evaluation recommendations that were made and explore some of the possible other determinants of program policy.

There is one dramatic example where the Board of Education modified, as a result of a Title I evaluation, its former policies concerning the education of pregnant school-age girls. More typically, however, the impact evaluations have had on New York City Title I programs is more limited. Most changes included in recycled project proposals are administrative, not educational, in nature -- the removal of a staff position or the replacement of one category of position with another. Some of the modifications in the project proposals seem to be based on evaluation recommendations. Many others are not, and may result from informal suggestions made by the project director during the course of the project's operation, or at its end.

For the 1967-68 school year, the Board's Summary of Proposed Programs[1]

---

[1] Summary, 1967-68, op.cit. The Summary of Proposed Program for the public hearing went to press before the date that the final complete evaluation reports were due at the Board; the recommendations incorporated in the Summary are taken from the interim reports and summaries of the final reports.

included statements indicating which of the revisions were based on the evaluators' recommendations. Some examples of the evaluation recommendations that the Board indicated they intended to include in the proposals for that year follow: efforts will be made to increase the efficiency of the cooperation between the two co-directors of SUTEC; implement better understanding between classroom teachers and corrective reading teachers by conducting workshops for nonpublic school staff; continue the inservice training of corrective reading and corrective mathematics teachers with special emphasis on the use of materials for instruction; establish classes to develop and foster the understanding of good mental health practices by the teachers in the nonpublic schools; send periodic bulletins to nonpublic schools with helpful materials for planning Bus Trips.

Title I program decisions in New York City reflects the political climate, the attitudes of educators, as well as the kinds of evaluations and recommendations that were made. The Summary of Proposed Programs, 1968-69 contains this statement: "The development of 1968-69 . . . programs represents a cooperative effort involving many different agencies who are concerned . . . . The comprehensive planning involved extensive consultation with . . . Council Against Poverty, the Standing Committee of Nonpublic School Officials, and the representatives of numerous civic and community groups . . . . Many program elements, substantive changes, and in some instances entire programs have resulted from the Council's recommendations."[2] The Board makes this statement to indicate its responsiveness to the local communities, but in doing so implies that not only do overall Title I program priorities reflect the political milieu, but project elements do also. Title I priorities and general programming are properly and by legislation the concern of the school administration and the community; evaluations should provide the data that would enable them to make systematic decisions. We feel strongly that project elements -- the specific plans, objectives, and procedures -- are areas in which it is appropriate for evaluators to make their contribution.

The tacit attitude of the general policy makers toward evaluation is reflected in the entire evaluation process; the first time any group of evaluators becomes involved is when the Bureau of Educational Research prepares the evaluation design to accompany the already developed project proposal submitted in fulfillment of SED requirements. Whenever the evaluators have accepted the project design as given to them, thereby having acquiesced in taking research on at the end stages of development, they have contributed to the attitude that evaluation is not important to program development. Actually, many evaluators have pointed out, in some instances again and again, the necessity to be involved in project planning. They have included in their reports a plea for earlier involvement and more involvement in formulating objectives and in selecting participants. But evaluators have never insisted upon this kind of consultation as a necessary contractual condition for evaluating a project. Partly because evaluators have had so little say in pupil

---

[2] Summary, 1968-69, op.cit.

or school selection or in stating objectives, they have often been unable to supply their audiences with definitive data about project effectiveness.

The evaluator, entering the process very late, is able to select for study those aspects of the project that he considers important, interesting, and measurable within the time span and limits of the budget. Since he works in relative isolation he may not appreciate that what may be of interest and importance to him may not be relevant to his audiences. Moreover, he may not realize that his view of the particular project may be distorted as a result of his unfamiliarity with many of the legal, political, contractual, and other complexities of Title I and of the school system in general. It is no wonder that evaluators of individual projects made same recommendations that were not practicable and, since they were rarely in a position to be able to make comparative suggestions, they rarely if ever suggested discontinuance of a project and the allocation of funds elsewhere.

Most of the recommendations appearing at the end of an evaluation report appear understandable and seem easy to implement, but when looked at overall and in retrospect, many were stated in terms that were general and vague. Thus, a recommendation that more classroom space is needed does not tell the program planner what to do; in contrast, the recommendation to reschedule the assignments of the corrective reading teacher and the corrective mathematics teacher, because there was not enough space to hold both remedial classes on the same day, was an eminently sensible suggestion that could be acted upon -- and was. It is easy for an evaluator to recommend better planning; it is much more difficult, especially in view of his limited knowledge of other projects, to suggest practical ways to accomplish this. It is one thing to find that the school climate has improved; it is quite another thing to do the type of study that would suggest reasons why the better climate has not resulted in better pupil achievement.

Furthermore, by accepting his isolation the evaluator is, whether or not he is aware of it, placed in situation in which he is doing more than attempting to ascertain educational truths -- he will find himself in the political and social realm. It has been only gradually and recently that evaluators have become more aware of the possible policital consequences of their findings. For example, the United Federation of Teachers had a commitment to the More Effective Schools project, since they played a significant role in developing the plans, and had a strong interest in its future. Beyond the educational merits of the project, wide adoption of the plan meant smaller classes, more teaching jobs, and more pleasant working conditions. The More Effective Schools report, which did not focus on these aspects, became a major part of the 1967 dispute between the Board and the teachers' union. Other instances can be cited where the political and social interests of an audience differed from the primary interests of the evaluators, with the result that frequently evaluations do not tell the reader what he wanted to know.

In some instances, however, the evaluator included inappropriate data,

or did ineffectual studies, in response to actual or perceived requests of others. For example, in the nonvisible projects the evaluators compiled with the request to provide achievement test data, even when it was apparent that the additional personnel were not recruited and no substantive project existed. When evaluators agree to continue an evaluation in the absence of a meaningful project, the evaluation is clearly a fiction that accomplished no more than fulfilling reporting requirements.

The deleterious effects of isolating the evaluators are best exemplified in the criteria of attainment or success. It is with these criteria that communication problems between researchers and educators are most evident. Within the framework of the current evaluation procedure, although the Board approves the evaluation design and instruments, the evaluator alone rather than together with the planner selects the criteria to judge the effectiveness of a project in meeting its objectives. For any objective there may be several criteria; for example, there are many indicators of attainment of the objective "to improve pupil attitude toward school." The evaluator may select increased attendance as a measure; the project directors may feel, however, that this was not as appropriate an indicator as, for example, an increase in the number of books borrowed from the school library. These differences may never become a subject of discussion, and may not even be apparent until the program planner reads the final report; since the planner may reject the evaluator's criterion, he can also reject his findings.

Most Title I evaluators have been trained in university departments of education or psychology. Their training has not provided them with the attitudes required for the new roles called for by Title I, nor with the tools for carrying out the kinds of evaluations that are needed. Evaluators need retraining in identifying the factors that are important, and in presenting them in a way that is helpful. Any new approach to evaluation also requires changes in attitudes toward evaluation. Both evaluators and project planners need to be oriented toward recognizing problem areas and taking corrective action within the operational span of the project. To do less is to be unfair to the children who might otherwise be exposed to at least a full year of a situation which is not meeting their needs.

A NEW EVALUATION MODEL

A new model of evaluation is called for, one emphasizing collaborative consultation, quick feedback and techniques to foster understanding of the project in both its educational and social contexts. The acceptance of evaluation findings might be facilitated if evaluators provided more definitive and helpful information, and if some rules were developed whereby the LEA was obligated to consider all evaluation findings in their modifications of program.

Collaboration implies not only earlier consultation but a new relationship between the evaluator and the educator; the relationship should be aimed

at integrating the knowledges, expectations, and intuitions of the program personnel into the evaluation process. At the same time the evaluator must make his requirements known. Such an effort in the initial project design states would ensure that the evaluator is emphasizing what is important to the program planner, and in terms the planner accepts as important.

Because different kinds of projects have different objectives, and because some activities are more fully developed than others, different evaluation schemes should be used. However, certain basic information is required for each project each year, describing the extent to which the project has beem implemented. This type of data collection has been called monitoring, and is basic to all other types of investigation. Monitoring information should be collected on a continuous basis and should be fed back immediately to the persons responsible for the day-to-day operation of the project. Had this kind of study been systematically undertaken, it is likely that many startup problems would not have occurred when new projects were started in later years. The monitoring data can also be the basis for an annual overall report to the SED, in that it should present a clear picture of the inputs made into Title I projects.

In the school year 1969-70, the Board of Education, at the request of the SED, distinguished between project monitoring and evaluation. This distinction was first initiated for the 200 to 300 district decentralized projects because a detailed study of the individual projects was impossible. The Board required the evaluators to collect some basic monitoring information about the implementation of each project, and also to study the outcomes of a few projects in depth. Such project monitoring has great potential value, but it can become simply another formal exercise unless there is provision for and acceptance of immediate feedback to persons who can take corrective action when it is warranted.

In addition to monitoring, either formative or summative evaluations, as described by Scriven, are called for, depending on the stage of development of the project. Formative evaluation is concerned with the improvement of educational strategies. This type of nonexperimental study should provide immediate suggestions for the refinement of projects. Formative evaluation focuses on the aspects of a project that are crucial to its success. Since it is not a closed system, it can be alert to potential sources of failure and frustration, and opportunities that might otherwise be missed. Formative evaluation requires intensive study of a smaller number of classrooms in depth. It is most relevant to projects under development, new approaches and methodologies, transplanting programs from one school system to another, and expanding pilot projects. The emphasis of formative evaluation should be to determine the conditions under which the project can best operate or under which it must fail, and to identify the factors associated with its potential success or failure in time to do something about it. By its very nature, formative evaluation should increase the interdependence between program people and evaluators and should help fill the needs of teachers, school administrators, and community leaders as well. A formative

evaluation focusing on improving educational strategies rather than a more summative type evaluation, study of More Effective Schools.

As a project develops to a more nearly and finished form, summative evaluation becomes more appropriate. Summative evaluation is more like the traditional controlled experiment and may include larger samples and more sophisticated measures and statistical techniques. It seeks to determine whether the project has been successful in improving the children's educational achievements.

The contribution of the Title I evaluations to policy decisions regarding funding, expansion, contraction, or discontinuance of projects is limited because there is at present no way in which one project can be directly compared with another. There has not been developed for Title I in New York City a system that can be used to measure the effectiveness of projects that have dissimilar goals or techinques. Operations researchers have developed decision models so that policy makers can handle such problems. Essentially the models are systematic ways of assigning numerical values to a common core of desired characteristics of projects, such as the need for a project, the adequacy with which it was implemented, and its impact on the children, the school, and the community. These values can be combined to give a numerical measure of the merits of each project.

The next step, one which is more difficult than it may seem at first glance, is to determine the cost of the project per pupil. These two measures, effectiveness and cost, can be combined to provide an estimate of cost-effectiveness which can contribute to the policy decisions.

In summary, monitoring can furnish useful information for smoother program operation, and for reporting on and summarizing experiences. Formative evaluations can provide the project planners with the kind of data needed to improve educational strategies. Summative evaluations can help the policy makers to set priorities and allocate funds. Operations research techniques can help to ensure a maximum benefit for the funds expended.

After careful study of more than one hundred individual evaluation reports we must conclude that one type of study and one final report cannot satisfy the needs of all the interested and concerned parties. The reports that have been written have generally not been widely disseminated; the Board of Education, which maintains responsibility for disseminating evaluation reports does not, for example, routinely transmit the findings to participating principals and their teaching staffs.

Alternate reporting forms may be necessary. For example, there should be one report for school staffs and project coordinators which should contain a description of what went on and the conditions under which the project seemed to work effectively. This report could identify participating schools by code designation, so that a particular school can remain annonymous and can be identified by the school administration so that they can make whatever changes in program operation are necessary. Although there are potential

dangers to such a code identification system, the benefits for followup comparisons are enormous.

Another less technical reporting form could be developed for parents, community representatives, and legislators. This report could draw contracts among a group of related projects, describing the variables that facilitate successful project outcomes; it should be widely disseminated and publicized, especially within the LEA's jurisdiction.

Researchers and program developers would need more detailed information -- copies of test instruments, complete statistical analyses, and analyses of budget expenditures -- to serve as a basis for improving educational strategies.

EVALUATION BUDGETS AND CONTRACTING

How much money should be spent on evaluating Title I projects? By law, only one percent of an LEA's total basic grant is reimbursable. This is a sharp contrast to the 5 to 10 percent currently budgeted for research and evaluation of projects initiated under Title VII and VIII of the ESEA.

Over the three-year period in New York City, the total proportion of funds allocated to evaluation has remained fairly constant, at approximately one percent of the funds budgeted for program, but there was considerable variation in the relationship between the size of the project budget and the size of the evaluation budget. The two largest projects in 1965-66, for example, were funded at approximately $8 million; both had evaluation budgets of $10,000. That year exactly the same amount was budgeted for each of the evaluations of the two smallest projects. From 1965-68, the percentage of project budgets allocated to evaluation of the largest projects was increased, and the percentage of the project budget allotted to evaluation of smaller projects was decreased to a low of $4,500 for one project.[3]

The decision on how much money is to be spent on evaluations is complex. The simplest rule, to allocate a fixed percentage of the project's cost to evaluation, fails to take into account other important considerations. The smallest projects might not receive an amount large enough to permit meaningful evaluation. On the other hand, one percent of $8 million may be too large, since there may be instances where an $80,000 study will not yield twice the information of a $40,000 one.

---

[3]Evaluation budgets for some projects were not available.

We believe that there should be an increase in the total percentage of funds allotted to the conduct of evaluations, but that the increase, if legislatively mandated, should be used in new ways and for new developments. The different types of evaluations that were described above require not only additional funds but differential allotments. It seems logical to spend proportionally more money on formative studies and on the more innovative projects about which less is known, and to spend less on summative evaluations of projects that are expansions of programs already well established. A large evaluation effort may also be justifiable for pilot projects and for those having broad political and social implications. Other factors, including the number of participating schools, should also be considered in the evaluation budget. Any additional funds for evaluation could be used to finance more followup studies and to develop new tests and other instruments.

Adoption of the different evaluation strategies recommended here, in addition to affecting the distribution of evaluation funds among projects, would lead to changes in the contractual relationship between the Board of Education and the outside agency; contracts may have to be established for varying periods of time with new reporting requirements. If the Board decided to collect a common core of information for all projects this would mean that it will incur other new obligations.

Whenever a substantial amount of money is spent for evaluation there is always adverse pressure from those who believe this use of funds diverts money from the children, but if well spent, evaluation will eventually mean a higher return to pupils. With the proliferation of special educational programs and decentralization of the City's school system there will be an increasing need for evaluation to provide information for decisions about continuing, modifying, and discontinuing program efforts. The enactors of the ESEA believed that evaluation could play an important role in program development.

Recently teachers and school administrators have shown increasing resistence to evaluation, manifested by a reluctance to cooperate with evaluators. Part of their resistance results from the existence of many projects in a school, which subjects the school to an evaluation of each project. This is an administrative problem, which might be lessened if projects were planned differently. A larger part of the reluctance to cooperate may result from the teachers' and administrators' feeling that they have not benefited from past evaluations, having rarely seen the evaluation findings. Some of these feelings might be alleviated if reports were systematically available to each school, and if the schools felt that their input was considered in formulating policy. The cooperation of these key people will not be won by explaining to them the mandate that each project must be evaluated. An increase in the evaluations are redesigned to serve the best interest of the children and teachers, and with some obligation on the part of the LEA to disseminate the findings and to carefully consider and accept recommendations

that would improve the quality of education for the disadvantaged child.

TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In New York City schools it has proved virtually impossible to carry out a true research design, especially summative evaluation designs. There is no random assignment of schools or classes to projects; all Title I - eligible schools may receive some Title I services. Comparisons between Title I schools and those that do not qualify would be confounded by the basic differences in economic and educational condition of the students. Instances where there are not enough resources to accommodate all the needy eligible children, a consideration of evaluation strategies in the planning state -- for example, random assignment of pupils or matched pairs -- would permit evaluators to better determine project effectiveness.

Pupil mobility in New York City, and in Title I schools in particular, is huge. During any academic year, in some schools the turnover rate may be more than 100 percent. Thus, while some children may sit at the same desk for an entire year, other desks may have three, four, or more occupants. With such high turnover in pupils, it is very difficult to identify a group of students who have been exposed to the full year's project. Computerized records would be immeasurably helpful in designing and conducting evaluations. In some other cities, social security numbers are obtained for children and used as identification throughout their academic careers. In this city of more than one million school children, it is often impossible to distinguish the records of one Juan Rodriquez from another. If one Juan moves from school to school, identifying him becomes increasingly difficult. And, supposing he can definitely be identified, there are still other problems. Only a clerical supersleuth could tell from Juan's high school records whether he went to an Open Enrollment elementary school. The detective would have to know whether he went to the school as part of the Open Enrollment project, or whether he already lived in the neighborhood of the school at that time.

Almost without exception, the evaluations of Title I projects in New York City have relied on traditional measures of achievement. Little attention has been paid to developing new tests, or new norms for old tests, although the available standardized instruments have long been considered inappropriate. These tests have been criticized on the grounds that they are biased in favor of middle class culture, that they are unreliable, and that they are not diagnostic. Test results are distorted by the widely acknowledged practice of coaching the children. Further, the tests themselves often bear little relationship to the types of pupil behavior expected from a project. Achievement and attitudes are testable, however, and meaningful tests and measures should be developed.

In the past, other than for achievement, each evaluator had constructed his own instruments with the results that it is impossible to compare any two investigations. While an individual evaluator should be left free to add questions relevant to his own study, he should be obligated to collect some

common information. A core of similar items for both pupils and staff should be incorporated into each project evaluation. These common results should be assembled centrally, so that norms and interpretations of scores could serve as a basis for comparative program judgments; these same data could be used for reporting to the SED and to the Office of Education.

Throughout this report we have urged undertaking specific investigations, and mentioned some broad research questions. In this final section we want to highlight three areas which we consider most important for future emphasis -- planning and evaluating grouped projects, followup studies, and cost-effectiveness studies.

If projects continue to be planned and evaluated as discrete entities, much of the potentially valuable data for cross-project comparisons is lost. Projects should be planned around the major aim or objective; adoption of this procedure would help eliminate duplication of resources and competition for children. Within each group of similar projects alternate strategies could be introduced, and the relative merits assessed. This kind of approach would be adaptable to the entire Title I program. There is a need for a better-informed basis not only for allocating funds to one of several speech projects, for example, but also for allocating funds to one program area rather than another.

In the past, the New York City Board of Education made available a very limited amount of money for the conduct of followup studies. In the first three years, three or four such studies were undertaken; they too suffer from the inadequacies of record-keeping and the high rate of pupil mobility, but they were important and worthwhile. An adequate followup study requires planning at the time the original evaluation is being planned. Funds for a followup have to be set aside and the kind of information that is desired should be considered in the original design. We would urge that more money and planning go into longitudinal and followup studies, especially in projects for young children and other projects where the question of durability of gains -- as they relate to costs -- is of primary importance. The federal Guidelines recognize the need for longer term investigations and perhaps should be modified to include more specific instructions on how to fund them.

So far, evaluations have not provided the most fundamental information needed by the Board of Education, the value received from the efforts to improve the education of the disadvantaged. It is sometimes argued that such programs are so diverse and intangible that they cannot be measured in comparable terms, but the fact is that such a measurement is made, informally, and intuitively, when the budget is decided on. The administrators assemble the best information they can, weigh the pros and cons, arrive at a subjective estimate of the worth of the program and then make their budgetary allotment. We urge that the Board of Education adopt a decision making procedure based on cost effectiveness and division theory concepts used in operations research studies. These procedures provide for amassing data on

the educational inputs, outputs and costs, and for systematically combining the information to provide cost effectiveness data that forms a sound basis for the budgetary decisions.

CHAPTER XVII

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is difficult if not impossible to rank the more than one hundred Title I projects in order of success. There are several reasons why this cannot be done. Projects have different objectives, and most projects have several objectives. Thus success, in terms of how well an objective was realized, may depend on which objective was selected; full attainment of a relatively unimportant objective is not as valuable as partial attainment of a more major aim. Since the projects were neither planned nor evaluated in a comparative manner, there is no single common set of criteria to use. As we have pointed out in the chapters on Objectives and Implementation, projects succeed and fail at different stages of development and for various reasons; a project that was not implemented as planned cannot be condemned as educationally unsound for failing to modify pupil performance. Finally, we believe that at present, we would contribute little to the decision-making process by comparing, for example, a project for speech-handicapped children with another project providing enrichment opportunities. It is more fruitful, we believe, to look at one objective at a time, and to study and contrast the various approaches to meeting it. This procedure, however, can be expanded to the entire program effort.

For each program chapter in this report we grouped related projects in a way that enables the reader to make comparisons among them. In doing so, and in our discussion of related projects, we have tried to single out common characteristics of the projects we judged as relatively more successful in achieving their major objective. Our judgment as to which of several objectives was the major one, and whether it was realized, is based on reading and rereading the individual project proposals and evaluation reports; on interviews with the Title I program people at the Board of Education; on study of the evaluation reports which include achievement test data and reports from participating staff and principals; and on our own experiences in carrying out many of the individual project evaluations.

The features that we have identified and judged to be associated with what we regard as successful Title I projects include the following: HIGH VISIBILITY, CLEARLY SPECIFIED POPULATIONS including CHILDREN WITH DEFINED NEEDS, CONCENTRATED RESOURCES, SPECIALLY SELECTED OR TRAINED STAFF, and COMMITMENT FROM OUTSIDE GROUPS. We do not mean to imply that any one of these factors singly or in combination will guarantee that a project will meet its objectives. Rather, we feel that these factors should be considered in future project planning, since they may facilitate, either administratively or organizationally, the operation of a project and thus facilitate its educational effectiveness. More evaluation effort should be directed to identifying with a greater degree of certainty the factors and conditions that facilitate or interfere with project success. Until they are subjected to more rigorous testing we should consider the factors listed above as hypotheses.

HIGH VISIBILITY

A visible project is one that can be identified as an entity, separable from the regular, ongoing educational program in the school. The project staff and school administration are aware of the existence of the project, even if they are unable to specify the source of funds. The parents, the staff, and the educational community at large can identify project elements and are often conversant with its major aims. Nonvisible projects, on the other hand, are interlocked with the regular school program and are generally distinguished solely by an allocation of additonal personnel. Frequently neither the additional personnel nor the school staff seem familiar with the intent of the project objectives, which are usually not clearly specified.

Since visible projects are generally better planned, we believe that they will be more successful than the less visible projects.

Highly visible projects are often located off school premises, or if on a school site, are organized as a school-within-a-school. The College Discovery and Development, Pregnant Girls, Benjamin Franklin Cluster, the Street Academies, and the centers established for children with special needs are all outside the regular school organization. This type of organizational pattern seems to increase the feeling of all project participants that they are engaged in a special educational endeavor. Moreover, the attention and publicity these projects receive may have motivational value for the children and the staff.

CLEARLY SPECIFIED POPULATIONS

Projects directed to meeting the clearly defined needs of a specific population will tend to be more successful in achieving their objectives than projects which seek to effect general improvements for children whose needs are unspecified. In general, the more identifiable the need of the target pupils, the more likely that objectives and techniques can be developed for meeting that need, and hence, the more likely it is that the project will be successful. Projects such as those for hearing-impaired or speech-impairedpupils, pregnant girls, and the mentally retarded have the advantage of a target population whose major need is quite specific and definable -- unlike the more general projects which include children with multiple, unspecified needs.

The majority of projects that have been initiated under Title I each contain several objectives, and are planned for many children with many unspecified needs. For these children it seems important to try to focus on a single problem area most in need of attention, rather than attempting to deal with many problems all at once. In terms of the child, his most pressing need should be identified -- not an easy task -- and he should participate in a project purposefully designed and concentrated to meet that need. Since available resources are

limited, this strategy may lead to temporary neglect of some of his other pressing problems, but it may in the longer term enable us to identify and remedy many of a child's specific problems much more economically. And it seems likely that amelioration of a child's most pressing problem would have carryover benefits to the child in ameliorating his other problems.

Pupil motivation should be considered in planning projects; it should prove easier to develop new ways of motivating children if projects are planned to cope with their own most pressing problem.

CONCENTRATED RESOURCES

Projects that provide a concentrated level of service tend to be more successful than projects in which the available resources are spread more thinly. The critical level of concentration of effort for various activities and for different children has not been satisfactorily determined. The degree of concentration is not always reflected in the size of the project budget, since expensive projects may include many children and a large number of activities.

Concentrated services may not mean innovative or experimental services; the curriculum for neither the College Discovery and Development nor the Pregnant Girls project was particularly innovative, but these projects are considered successful in achieving their goal of continued education. However, the absence of a specially adapted curriculum when a need for one clearly exists, as in the preschool programs which involve a new pupil population, will hinder the effectiveness of the project. Moreover, if instructional techniques and methodologies are not related to the project objectives, then those techniques, no matter how concentrated they are, probably cannot modify pupil behavior in terms of the stated project objectives.

SPECIALLY SELECTED AND TRAINED STAFF

In general, specially selected or trained staff will facilitate learning; since teachers are the prime educational agent, it is of critical importance to select and train them carefully. Adding more professional and nonprofessional staff to a project to reduce class size or to improve the pupil-teacher ratio has not, in and of itself, proved an effective procedure. Unless the staff is trained to use small class size to better advantage, there is no evidence that more teachers means educational opportunities.

In some of the projects that were more effective in achieving their aims, such as College Bound, some teachers volunteered for the assignment; in other projects, such as Pregnant Girls, the project staff expressed a deep interest in and commitment to the project. The attitudes of teachers

and their commitment to project objectives may be as important as their technical competencies.

COMMITMENT FROM OUTSIDE GROUPS

In general, commitment or support for projects by groups located outside the elementary and secondary school framework may facilitate the projects' effectiveness. The relationships between The City University of New York and the College Discovery and Development project, between the College Bound Corporation and the College Bound project, or between the Urban League and the Street Academies projects are examples. The Benjamin Franklin Cluster had the support of the local community; P129 did not: Pregnant Girls had the endorsement of the Council Against Poverty; and More Effective Schools has the sanction of the United Federation of Teachers.

There may be one exception to the value of external support involving a particular school-university relationship where a university "adopts" a school. Although there are only a few instances of this kind of relationship under Title I -- P129 and Yeshiva University, Benjamin Franklin Cluster and Teachers College, and SUTEC and Queens College -- the results of these projects seem to be uneven. These types of relationships should be investigated further to determine the conditions under which they can work out well in actual practice.

Throughout this report we have made a series of suggestions and recommendations whose adoption we believe would result in an improved Title I program. Many of the suggestions were explicit while others were implied. On the basis of our experience with the Title I program in New York City, we feel quite strongly that, with some modification, Title I can improve the quality of education for the deprived children. On the following pages we summarize major recommendations which we believe should improve the operation of this program. Most of the following recommendations are general suggestions about how to proceed; we feel that Title I projects will be more effective if certain modifications are made in the way they are planned, designed, and operated. We have left it up to the people who know the content matter best to suggest specific ideas or techniques to be used to meet the needs of pupils.

Our recommendations are stated with the admonishing word, "should," since to be less direct would seem to avoid the issue, but we recognize that one man's "should" may be another man's more tentatively stated suggestion. We do not mean to speak dogmatically, but we believe that if we do not make positive recommendations we are failing in our responsibility to summarize our experience.

During the period we studied, some Title I funds were decentralized, but the City's educational system was centralized. As New York City moves toward decentralizing its educational system, and if a large proportion of Title I funds are also decentralized -- placed under the

jurisdiction of the district superintendents -- many of our recommendations will become obsolete. In an attempt to forestall this, we have tried to word our recommendations so that either the Central Board, referred to as the LEA, or the local district administrative units may act upon them. Moreover, we have included suggestions that have wider applicability; many of them apply to local educational agencies in general, to state education departments, and to the federal government, particularly to Congress which makes the laws, and to the Office of Education which interprets and administers them. Recommendations are not of value unless they are specific; we have, therefore, attempted to direct our comments not only at what should be done to improve program operation, but who should do it.

The Congress should amend the wording of Title I so as to encourage imaginative and innovative attempts to improve education. Specifically, the words "to expand and improve . . . their educational programs" permit an LEA too great latitude in programming. By modifying the language of the original Act, some educational limits could be placed on the types of projects initiated. The limitations should encourage original and creative solutions to meeting the needs of economically and educationally deprived children.

Future projects should incorporate agreed on characteristics that are likely to facilitate project effectiveness, either those discussed above, or others more rigorously determined on the basis of systematic experiences.

The Board of Education should consider modifying its organizational structure so that there will be more opportunity for new programmatic efforts. The administrative organization of Title I in New York City is not conducive to innovative programming. The structure should be reexamined, with a view toward developing a new pattern of interrelationships to encourage exploration of and receptivity to new program ideas.

Increased community participation in the planning and conduct of projects seems to have a potential for bringing fresh points of view to bear on old problems. We do have the experience to recommend that whatever the involvement is to be, it must be stated clearly and must be carried out.

The Congress should appropriate the full amount of funds provided by law, rather than the lesser, prorated amount. These additional funds should be earmarked primarily for LEA use. The LEA should use the increased funds for planning and coordinating projects, for evaluating projects, and for providing more concentrated per-pupil activity.

The Congress should modify the Title I legislation so that longer-term funding is possible. As it stands now, the funding cycle is poorly related to the educational planning cycle. Since most educational endeavors require commitment for more than one year for educationally sound planning, it is especially important that Title I activities be planned in a continuous manner since Title I involves the cooperation of the community, the parents, and the nonpublic schools. Educational benefits and good will are lost when projects can be planned only on a year-to-year basis because of future funding uncertainties.

Long-term funding would give LEAs the impetus to plan Title I activities over a longer period of time and to plan in a sequential manner. Some provision should be made for carrying over unexpended funds into following years.

The LEA should initiate long-range planning of Title I activities. Projects can be made more effective if they can be successively refined over a period of time. Long-range planning is necessary for training and retraining staff and developing new curricula and instructional techniques. The amount of funds the LEA budgets for its administrative functions should be increased to provide for the salary of a person who would be responsible for continuous planning.

As New York City decentralizes its educational system, some type of central planning may be necessary if the children are to be assured of continuity of service. Since the LEA's responsibilities include establishing an overall program and disseminating information, the central Board of Education could make a great contribution by coordinating with 30 districts' Title I activities and by providing them with programmatic ideas and effective educational strategies adaptable to the needs of local children.

The LEA should undertake an up-to-date estimate and projection of the total resources of the system, especially its manpower resources. This estimate should include personnel, space, supplies, and materials.

Repeatedly, year after year, projects were not implemented because the needed resources were not available in sufficient quantity.

When there are not adequate resources of any one kind, the LEA should plan alternate strategies to meet the project objectives. For example, if adequate numbers of specialists are not available, the Board could experiment with paraprofessionals, or initiate inservice teacher training activities, or examine its licensing requirements for that specialty.

In particular, the employment of the paraprofessional merits careful planning and study. As paraprofessionals fill a more demanding role, both they and professional teachers will need additional training, and some modification will have to be made in the educational structure to accommodate the demands of the new role definitions.

The Board of Education should improve its record-keeping procedures. The LEA needs faster and more accurate estimates of projected and actual project expenditures and of accruals, for both personnel and non-personnel costs. Record-keeping procedures need to be modernized. Computerized record-keeping procedures are initially expensive to install but can produce great economies.

New York City needs pupil identification numbers. Such a numbering sytem, together with a record of project participation, is a first step toward building a central computerized facility to chart each child's progress through school.

Title I should be planned and coordinated with the other Titles of the ESEA, and with other special state and federal programs. This coordination should be the basic responsibility of the state education departments, although both the federal government and the LEA also need to assume some responsibility. New York City may not be using most advantageously all the opportunities that are available to it.

As more new special local, state, and federal educational programs are initiated, and as the City moves further in decentralizing educational responsibility, there will be a growing need to plan and coordinate programs and funds to reduce overlap and to fill in gaps. This might require assigning a small staff of one or two persons to explore new funding opportunities.

The Board of Education should redraft its Title I priorities and should fund identifiable projects that relate to the priorities. The LEA should spend Title I funds for identifiable projects that contribute to meeting high-priority needs of children. The process of establishing priorities reflecting the children's needs is a continuing one which needs revisions based on changing educational, social, and psychological experiences and philosophies.

The Title I program should complement, not replace, the LEA's ongoing educational program; the funds should be used to augment its other efforts to improve education for deprived children. Additional federal guidelines and stricter enforcement of them may be necessary to ensure that Title I is not being used as general aid.

The federal government and the LEA should attempt to define the Title I target population more specifically. Because the ESEA includes both educational and economical deprivation in its definition, it has been extremely difficult to specify an appropriate target population.

The criteria of economic deprivation that have been developed locally have become more clearly defined over the years but there are still disparities. The Board of Education should continue to reduce the present disparities. Many school eligibility problems that were considered solved may reemerge in the decentralized system -- but not all problems in all 30 districts.

Defining educational deprivation is a complex task involving an examination of fundamental educational and social objectives. To define as educationally deprived those pupils who score below some standard on some test does not adequately address the problem. There are many children who can never achieve average performance for a variety of reasons, and on the other hand, there are students who, although achieving on an average level, are educationally deprived because their capacity is above their current level of performance.

At present Title I cannot meet all the needs of all poor children; some choices need be made. We cannot attempt to resolve the problem of choice, but we can recommend that the LEA must make clear what children have priority and undertake the appropriate actions.

The LEA should undertake an independent assessment of the needs of the target population. The assessment should be the basis for future project planning and for allocating resources. It should be conducted on a systematic basis and should include a realistic estimate of the number

of pupils with a given need. It should aim at identifying the major educational problem of the individual pupil, the problem most in need of attention.

Regular reassessment of pupil needs, in and of itself, would offer the additional benefit of providing a gross evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I program.

The LEA should design projects around single objectives related to the assessed needs of the target population. Planning projects around major needs would permit a better allocation of resources, less duplication of services, and less competition for participants. If, for example, many pupils are identified as having a major speech problem, a group of speech-related projects could be planned. The specific speech needs, whether of non-English-speaking children, or speech-handicapped children, or children with speech defects, would determine the specific strategies for improving their speech. It would be easier to provide the child with concentrated services and it should prove easier to motivate the child to improve in one clearly defined area.

A group of these related projects should be evaluated together so that comparisons can be made among the different approaches employed. If the LEA continues to recycle projects with multiple objectives, however, it must indicate the relative importance of those objectives, and allocate sufficient resources to accomplish each goal.

The LEA should specify selection criteria for pupil participation in each project. For specific projects, the program planners and evaluators together need to develop criteria for pupil selection, as well as the techniques for diagnosis of the child's specific difficulties. These criteria should continue to be somewhat flexible -- specific scores on specific tests should not be required -- but every attempt should be made to select only those pupils who exhibit the need that the project is designed to meet.

If departures from the selection criteria are acceptable and indicated, careful records should be maintained describing the reasons for and basis of the departures.

In those instances where a project is planned for fewer children than the total number of eligible children exhibiting the need, the project planners and evaluators should assign children or schools on a random or matched-pair basis; this kind of assignment would provide comparison groups and would permit more rigorous and definitive evaluations.

The federal, state, and local agencies should make certain that services to children are concentrated enough to ensure a change in their behavior. The LEA especially needs to investigate the optimum level of concentration -- the quality and quantity of the services that are needed to bring about the desired changes in pupil performance. If funds are spread too thinly over a variety of activities, the likelihood is that there will not be a reasonable chance for impact. More research is needed to determine the level of concentration for different needs and for needs of differing severity.

The Congress should amend the legislation so that there are increased funds for Title I evaluations. It is our belief that strengthening evaluations will result in improved education and an eventual saving of money. Evaluation of Title I has proved to be a complex task; the one percent allocation is not sufficient to improve the usefulness of evaluations so that they can provide a better basis for program modification.

Increased funds for evaluation should be used in new ways. Monitoring projects and conducting formative and summative studies should be considered as new approaches to project refinement and decision-making. Cost-effectiveness techniques need to be developed. There should be increased effort to undertake more followup and longitudinal studies, and to fund pilot studies and more basic research in teaching and learning. New test instruments and other procedures are needed to diagnose pupils' problems and to assess program effectiveness.

The Congress should make the evaluating and reporting cycle more flexible. The annual reporting requirement has not had the desired results; the reports have been late, there has been little feedback during the course of a project's operation, and there has been little modification of projects as a result of the evaluation findings.

At present, project planners must carry out their function in the absence of information that could help them modify their plans. The adverse effects of the evaluation cycle are exaggerated in New York City because evaluators have been dependent on the citywide tests of achievement. Adoption of monitoring and of formative and summative evaluation strategies would lead naturally to different reports and different reporting times, although each project could continue to receive an annual evaluation of some kind.

The Office of Education should develop and mandate the use of standardized data collection procedures. Sound tests and other data collection methods should be developed to provide a core of comparable information from all projects so that evaluation can provide more meaningful and interpretable information.

The LEA should use evaluation in program development. An improvement in the usefulness of evaluations requires changes in the responsibilities and relationships that exist between project planners and evaluators. Formative evaluation has the potential for facilitating the interdependence of evaluators and educators as well as for improving education. They should work together from the very inception of the project in planning, stating objectives and criteria of attainment, and in selecting schools and pupils. Working together effectively may mean new attitudes of respect and commitment to improving educational opportunities for children.

Working in this way, the evaluators should develop new procedures to identify the factors that facilitate or hinder program effectiveness, and should provide the school administration with immediate feedback and suggestions. This suggestion implies retraining of evaluators and establishing new requirements for them. Program personnel need orientation to the possibilities that good evaluations can provide; they also need to develop ways to make warranted corrections in a project during the course of its operation.

The LEA should move toward a rational, systematic decision-making process for allocating Title I funds. As more educational projects are initiated, it will become increasingly necessary for the LEA to identify effective projects. If projects are planned and evaluated around their major objectives, comparative research can be done and can provide some data for funding decisions. Thus progress can be made toward wise allocation of scarce funds among competing projects.

Evaluation contracts should be for a group of related projects so that one project may be compared with another on the basis of common measures. This procedure would help planners refine their strategies and would also reduce the duplication of evaluation efforts.

The LEA should be required to evaluate its total program as well as each individual project. The total program study should present a picture of the total input under Title I, a complete and detailed study of implementation, and an assessment of outcomes. For this study to assist future planning, it must be carefully planned in advance and should be built around a common core of information that should be required from the evaluations of the individual projects. A computerized record-keeping procedure is necessary and will facilitate such overall evaluation.

For the evaluation of individual projects, the LEA should allocate evaluation funds according to project size and complexity, innovativeness, social significance, and the type of evaluation called for by the stage of the project's development.

All levels of government should increase the emphasis on dissemination. As a matter of public accountability all governmental agencies should make certain that information about intended project plans is disseminated. All agencies should disseminate information about project results for projects that have been successful as well as for those projects that have not been successful in meeting their objectives. In addition, more detailed technical and fiscal information should be made readily available to all interested and concerned people.

The New York City Board of Education should make concerted efforts to systematically disseminate to all participating school principals, teaching staffs, and parents or community groups information about project objectives, techniques, strategies, and desired results for pupils. The Board of Education must also improve its procedures for disseminating project results and should consider using different forms for reporting to different audiences.

Title I should be revised and strengthened. Our study of the first three years of Title I in the nation's largest city has indicated that despite its weaknesses Title I can continue to be an important vehicle for advancing education.

It is our belief that Title I can be made to operate better with some revisions in the existing legislation and with some modifications of established practices. One alternative is, of course, to write a new education law. However historically in our nation, new legislation unfortunately has not always capitalized on past experience. Furthermore, any new law would generate a whole new series of problems for local agencies just when ESEA rules are understood. But there is nothing in the current Act to prevent the improvement of controls over program quality; new administrative requirements are needed to ensure quality and accountability in the expenditure of public funds.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was less than a perfect law. It was a compromise law, mirroring the tensions and viewpoints of the society at large and permitting the local agencies the opportunity to work through the issues at the local level. Like most innovative federal legislation it reflected concern with deep-rooted national problems which could not be surmounted by a single act of Congress. Its passage increased the dilemmas of the various groups who would be involved in its implementation, for the ESEA raised questions about the role of evaluation in program development and about community representation in educational decision-making without specifying how these questions were to be answered. The ESEA was not intended to provide resolutions to the church-state relationship, to desegregation of the schools, nor to the spiraling costs of education. And, the ESEA did not seek to anticipate the problems brought about by new national trends -- the changing structure of society, the new power negotiations, and the increasing militancy of students, parents, and teachers.

Title I has had accomplishments. Because of this legislation, attention has been focused on the needs of the impoverished child, no matter whether he was in a public, a private, or an institutional school; he could be physically handicapped or neglected or delinquent; he could be of preschool age or college-bound. Because of this legislation, LEAs were alerted to consider the special educational needs of their children, to define and identify educational deprivation, and to seek solutions to children's educational problems. Title I suggested some new approaches including employment of paraprofessionals and tutors, combined work-study programs, and special remedial and enrichment classes. Title I allowed continuation of ongoing programs and at the same time encouraged innovative endeavors and pilot projects. The original legislation also emphasized the importance of concentrating activities to ensure a reasonable chance for success. The Title I legislation expanded the opportunity for people previously excluded from educational policy formulation to have a voice in the education of their children. Title I mandated new relationships between public and private educational systems, between the various levels of government, and between educators and evaluators. It allowed local autonomy, provided successively higher checks and balances, and built in public accountability. Title I furnished a vehicle by which the federal government could enforce other civil rights legislation, and it encouraged state and local agencies to plan projects that capitalized on related legislation.

Where then lies the responsibility for its unfulfilled promises and limited successes? We cannot point to any one individual, nor to any one group, nor to any one level of government and say, "the fault is yours." Without exception, every person we came into contact with was seeking, with integrity and within the limits of his responsibilities, the best way of fulfilling the purposes of the law. And if readers excerpt or summarize from this document, we want to caution against a hasty and unthinking pointing to blame. That was not our intention

and would not reflect our experience.

Perhaps in some sense Title I's strengths were also to become the reasons for its failures; since the legislation was so flexible, Title I became an arena in which the war against poverty through improved education took place. The participants in the struggle included the federal Office of Education, the state education department, the Board of Education, the representatives of private educational systems, the evaluators, the educators, and parent and community groups.

Within this arena, the representatives of the parochial schools, partially responsible for the passage of the Act, continued to press the demands that remained unsatisfied by the legislation. The representatives of the community also used Title I for other, non-educational -- albeit important -- campaigns; much of their energy went into blockades and side skirmishes. The individual teachers took advantage of opportunities opened by Title I but were often limited by outmoded techniques and inappropriate preparation. As an organized group, the teachers, sought to institutionalize their own hard-won gains, but at some cost in harmony and trust. In continuing to do what they knew how to do best, the program planners and developers perpetuated old tactics; but they were not alone in doing so. The general command, the Board of Education, faced new demands, new problems, and new potential partners. The Board may be faulted for being attentive to the counsel of many and for taking the wrong actions on too many fronts, with untrained and insufficient numbers of troops and resources. The evaluators maintained a position of nonintervention and defended it in the face of clear needs for feedback. Within the powers granted by law, the state department of education could have been an active facilitator; its failure was largely inaction. And the federal Office of Education could have exercised more control and direction within the framework of the various Titles of the ESEA, but they did not have fiscal flexibility and were operating in a situation where high national priority was not placed on education. Moreover, the Title I battle was fought with inadequate lines of communication and dissemination. It was a battle fought anew each year and with very limited funds.

At the outset, none of the participants was prepared with enough knowledge about how to improve education for the deprived. Regardless of the source for today's educational problems, it has become increasingly evident that small amounts of money alone will not provide the solution. It is possible that massive amounts of money and concentration of expenditures might make an improvement in the quality of education. It seems very much more probable, however, that the hope for the future lies in developing, refining, and experimenting with new educational strategies and with identifying the variables within a program or within a child's experience that will lead to real and lasting solutions.

The solutions will not come easily, and the problem is not new. Over one hundred years ago, in 1854, Thoreau wrote in Walden: "We have a comparatively decent system of common schools . . . it is time we had uncommon schools . . . . Alas! what with foddering our cattle and tending the store, we are kept from school too long . . . If it is necessary, omit one bridge over the river [and instead] throw one arch . . . over the darker gulf of ignorance which surrounds us."

The experiences with Title I have made it unequivocally clear that we still do not know how best to overcome this gulf of ignorance for a large number of our school children. We hope this report helps show the way in which Title I affords us the opportunity to learn how best to make uncommon schools for our children.

INDEX

A modified Index of abbreviated Title I project names, underlined in the text of this report, follows. The project names are arranged alphabetically.

This Index directs the reader to the program area chapter in which the project was classified for this study and in which it is discussed in most detail. In addition, the page numbers of other chapters in which the project is mentioned in the text are listed.

Achievement tests	XV	
After School Study Centers (ASSC)	VIII	31
Aides for Libraries	XIV	
Attendance Services	XI	
Auxiliary Aide	XIV	20, 45
Basic Speech Improvement	X	41, 42, 151
Benjamin Franklin Cluster	VII	26, 134, 169, 171
Bus Trips	IX	21, 93, 151, 158
Camping for Leadership	VII	
Career Guidance Classes	XI	
Centers for Mentally Retarded Children	XII	
Child Caring Institutions	XI	75
Citizenship Classes (see Special Guidance)	XI	
Clinical Guidance (see Guidance Centers)	XI	
Clinical Speech Therapy	X	
College Bound	VII	26, 31, 45, 58, 170, 171
College Discovery and Development Program (CDDP)	VII	28, 40, 47, 58, 106, 169, 170, 171

Compensatory Education	VI	32, 106
Comprehensive High Schools	VI	30, 31
Corrective Mathematics	VIII	21, 25, 26, 37, 41, 42, 151
Corrective Reading	VIII	21, 151
Demonstration and Teacher Training	XIII	151
District Decentralized	XIV	15, 31, 32, 54, 147
Early Identification Classes	XI	
Educational Enrichment	VIII	
English-as-a-Second Language	VIII	151
Evening Guidance (see Guidance Centers)	XI	
Expanded Kindergarten	V	117
Five Primary Schools or Five Schools	V	20, 39
Followup in 13 Schools	V	
Follow-Through	V	20, 61
Guidance Centers	XI	21, 26, 41, 93, 117, 151
Guidance Clinics (see Guidance Centers)		
Handicapped Children	XII	151
Head Start	V	30, 31, 40, 129
Hearing- and Language-Impaired	XII	
Homework Helper	XIV	
Hospital Schools (400 Schools)	VII	
Improved Services	VI	30, 31, 41, 56, 91, 106
Inschool Guidance (see Guidance Centers)	XI	
Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent	XV	
Intensive Teacher Training Project (ITTP)	XIII	54, 149, 151

Internship for Principals: Operation Leadership	XIII	
Interscholastic Athletics	IX	
IS 201	VIII	
Junior Guidance Classes	XI	
Junior High School Summer Project	VIII	
Kindergarten Aides or Kindergarten Pilot	XIV	
Middle Schools	VI	30, 31, 41
More Effective Schools (MES)	VI	30, 31, 39, 41, 49, 54, 56, 91, 102, 106, 117, 127, 159, 171
Musical Talent Showcase	IX	
Neighborhood Youth Corps	VII	
Open Enrollment (OE)	VI	9, 16, 27, 30, 31, 37, 41, 56, 91, 127, 165
Operation Return	VII	58
Out-of-School-Guidance (see Guidance Centers)	XI	
Parent Followup (see Followup in 13 Schools)	V	
Parent Involvement	XIV	
Pregnant Girls	VII	45, 58, 136, 169, 170, 171
Prekindergarten	V	16, 20, 31
Program to Excite Potential (PEP)	VII	
P129	VI	127, 134, 171
Remedial and Tutorial Afterschool Centers	VIII	
Schools for Mentally Retarded Children	XII	
Sixteen (16) Institutions	XI	
Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed (SMED)	XI	30, 41, 75, 89
Spanish-Speaking Teachers	XIII	45, 136

Speech Therapy	X	21, 41, 42
Special Guidance Classes	XI	
Street Academies	VII	58, 169, 171
Strengthened Early Childhood	V	20, 39, 47, 127, 129, 136
Summer Day Elementary Schools	VIII	98, 99
Summer School Program	VIII	30, 31
SUTEC	XIII	158, 171
Teacher-Moms	XI	
Teacher Training and Reading Institutes	XIII	30
Transitional Schools	VI	30, 31, 56, 91
TV and AV with Teacher Training	XIII	41, 151

REFERENCES

Following is a list of reports on Title I projects in New York City that we consulted in this study.

The listing is alphabetical by senior author within the program content areas. For brevity we have adopted abbreviations of the names of the evaluating agencies. The abbreviations used in the citations are:

CUE, Center for Urban Education; New York City.

BER, Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education of the City of New York.

CUNY, Division of Teacher Education of The City University of New York.

Queens College, Department of Education, Queens College of The City University of New York.

NYU, Center for Field Research and School Services, School of Education, New York University; New York City.

ERB, Educational Records Bureau; Greenwich, Connecticut.

TITLE I EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM REPORTS

Almeida, Cynthia. A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools, 1968-69. CUE, October 1969.

Castiglione, Lawrence V. and Mary Wilsberg. The Expansion of Kindergarten and Prekindergarten Programs in Disadvantaged Areas of New York City, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Chaplan, Abraham A. and Joan Platoff. Preschool Child Development Program (Head Start) in Disadvantaged Areas of New York City, Summer 1967. CUE, November 1967.

Jenkins, William O. and Edna M. Phillips. Special Primary Programs in Five Schools, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Kraus, Philip E. A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools: Diagnosis and Special Instruction in Reading, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Kravetz, Nathan and Edna M. Phillips. Special Primary Program in Five Schools, 1968-69. CUE, October 1969.

North, Robert D. and David B. Orr. Prekindergarten Classes in Poverty Areas, 1967-68. The Psychological Corporation (with subcontractual support from Software Systems, Inc.), October 1968.

Schwartz, Sydney L. Expanded Prekindergarten Program, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Schwartz, Sydney L. Preschool Child Development Centers (Head Start) in Disadvantaged Areas of New York City, Summer 1966. CUE, August 1966.

Wilsberg, Mary, Lawrence V. Castiglione, and Sydney L. Schwartz. A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools: Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades I and II, and the Provision of Additional Materials, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

TITLE I REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REPORTS

Frankel, Edward. The Four-Year Comprehensive High School Program: Ninth Year Transfer Plan, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Frankel, Edward. Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Four-Year Comprehensive High School, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Frankel, Edward. Followup Evaluation of the Comprehensive High Schools. CUE, September 1968.

Frankel, Edward. Grade Reorganization of the Middle Schools in the Public School System, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Fox, David J. Free-Choice Open Enrollment: Elementary Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Fox, David J. Expansion of the Free-Choice Open Enrollment Program, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Fox, David J., Colleen Stewart, and Vera Pitts. Services to Children in Open Enrollment Receiving Schools, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Fox, David J., Marietta Shore, and Rosemary Conway. Improved Educational Services in Selected Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Fox, David J. Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Fox, David J., and others. More Effective Schools, 1967-68. CUE, December 1968.

Fox, Louise W. A Program to Improve Academic Achievement in Poverty Area Schools, 1968-69. CUE, October 1969.

Heller, Barbara R. A Special Enrichment Program Geared to Excellence for Schools in Transitional Areas, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Kravetz, Nathan. Academic Excellence in an Inner City Elementary School: P129K, 1967-68. CUE, October 1968.

Kravetz, Nathan, and others. The More Effective Schools Program, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Kravetz, Nathan. A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Neckritz, Benjamin. Compensatory Educational and Supportive Services for Pupils in Poverty Area Schools, 1967-68. BER, No. 22-620, (Summary Report), October 1968.

Schwartz, E. Terry. An Evaluation of the Transitional Middle School in New York City, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Steinhoff, Carl R. Improved Educational Services in Selected Special Service Elementary and Junior High Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Thorndike, Robert L. Free-Choice Open Enrollment: Junior High Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

TITLE I MOTIVATIONAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REPORTS

Appel, Yetta H. and Deborah Shapiro. An Educational Facility for Pregnant School-Age Girls, District 12, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Appel, Yetta H. Educational Facilities for Pregnant School-Age Girls, 1968-69. CUE, October 1969.

Brody, Lawrence, Beatrice Harris, and Genaro Lachica. A Report of the Third Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, 1967-68. CUNY, No. 69-1, March 1969.

Brody, Lawrence, Beatrice Harris, and Genaro Lachica. A Report of the Second Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, 1966-67. CUNY, No. 68-2, March 1968.

Guerriero, Michael A. Benjamin Franklin High School-Urban League Street Academies Program, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Horowitz, Gilbert R. and George Forlano. An Evaluation of Operation "Return": Learning Centers for Suspended Students in 4 Districts, 1967-68. BER, September 1968.

Horowitz, Gilbert R., Robert Lovinger, and George Forlano. An Evaluation of College Bound Program, Summer 1967. BER, December 1967.

Lolis, Kathleen. A Pilot Program for the Education for Pregnant School-Age Girls, 1966-67. BER, No. 22-609, June 1967.

Lovinger, Robert J. College Bound Program, 1967-68. BER, No. 22-624, March 1969.

Lovinger, Robert J. College Bound Program, Summer 1968. BER, November 1968.

North, Robert D., and others. College Bound Program, 1967-68. Psychological Corporation (with subcontractual support from Software Systems, Inc.), (Interim Report), March 1968.

Peck, Bernard, Max Weiner, and Marcella Williams. A Program to Provide Educational Enrichment for Disadvantaged In School Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees During the Summer, 1966. CUE, September 1966.

Rothbell, Gladys and Judith A. Eisler. Benjamin Franklin High School Cluster Program, 1967-68. CUE, December 1968.

Tanner, Daniel and Genaro Lachica. A Report of the First Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program, 1965-66. CUNY, January 1967.

Williams, E. Belvin and Robert S. Tannenbaum. Educational Enrichment for Disadvantaged In School Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees During the Summer 1967. CUE, November 1967. (Subcontracted to the Behavioral Sciences Center.)

SUPPLEMENTARY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Bernstein, Bruce H. The After School Study Centers for Disadvantaged Public and Nonpublic School Pupils: Remedial and Tutorial, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Bolger, Philip and Howard Tilis. Improving Teaching of English as a Second Language in Grades K-6, 1967-68. BER, No. 22-623, (Interim Report), Undated.

Carton, Aaron S. Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

Educational Records Bureau. Corrective Mathematics Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools, 1967-68. ERB, Undated.

Educational Records Bureau. Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. ERB, Undated.

Fox, David J., Norman R. Shapiro, and Valerie Barnes. Summer 1967 Elementary School Program for Disadvantaged Pupils in Poverty Areas of New York City. CUE, (Subcontracted to The City College Research Foundation), November 1967.

Fox, David J., Linda Curtis, and Valerie Barnes. Followup Study of Children who attended Summer 1967 Elementary School Program. CUE, March 1969.

Fox, David J. and Emmeline Weinberg. Summer 1967 Schools for Junior High and Intermediate School Pupils. CUE, (Subcontracted to The City College Research Foundation), November 1967.

Grossman, Anne S. Corrective Mathematics Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Lohman, Maurice A. After School Tutorial and Special Potential Development Program in I.S. 201 Manhattan, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Lohman, Maurice A. Educational Enrichment Programs for Disadvantaged Pupils in Public and Nonpublic Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Lohman, Maurice A. The Expansion of the After School Study Centers for Disadvantaged Public and Nonpublic School Pupils, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

North, Robert D. and David B. Orr. Program for Pupils in Nonpublic Schools Learning English as a Second Language, 1967-68. The Psychological Corporation (with subcontractual support from Software Systems, Inc.), November 1968.

Parke, Margaret B. Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Sontag, Marvin, and others. Evaluating Selected Aspects of the After School Study Center Program, 1965-66. BER, No. 22-551-02, December 1966.

Steinhoff, Carl R. Summer 1966 Program in Music and Art for Disadvantaged Pupils in the Public and Nonpublic Schools. CUE, August 1966.

Tieman, Norman. Evaluation of the Operation and Effectiveness of Summer School Programs, Summer 1966. BER, No. 22-453, June 1967.

Valenti, Bertrand F. and Benjamin Neckritz. Summer 1967 Vocational and Technical High School Program for Disadvantaged Students. BER, 22-631-049, December 1967.

TITLE I ENRICHMENT PROGRAM REPORTS

Bolger, Philip A. Evaluation of the Interscholastic Athletic Program of 1965-66. BER, No. 22-464-12, December 1966.

Fox, David J. and Eric Ward. Summer 1967 Musical Talent Showcase for Disadvantaged High School Students. CUE, (Subcontracted to The City College Research Foundation), November 1967.

Rosenthal, Harvey M. Educational Field Trips for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. CUE, October 1968.

Senf, Rita. Bus Transportation to Places of Civic and Cultural Interest in New York City for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

TITLE I SPEECH PROGRAM REPORTS

Carton, Aaron S. Basic Speech Improvement Program for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools: Regular Day Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Duker, Sam. Speech Therapy for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Fox, David J., Fred Wright, and Leo Goldstein. Summer 1967 Clinics for Speech Handicapped Pupils. CUE, November 1967

Fox David J. and Fred Wright. Followup Study of Children Who Attended Summer 1967 Clinics for Speech Handicapped Children. CUE, March 1969.

Rigrodsky, Seymour. Speech Therapy Services in Nonpublic Schools: Regular Day Schools and Interim After School Centers, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Rigrodsky, Seymour. Speech Therapy for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Young, Linda. Speech Improvement Program for Disadvantaged Children in 25 Selected Public Schools, 1965-66. BER, No. 22-461, March 1967.

Young, Linda. Speech Improvement Program for Disadvantaged Children in 25 Selected Public Schools, 1966-67. BER, No. 22-584, Fall 1967.

TITLE I GUIDANCE PROGRAM REPORTS

Bartky, Murray and Blanka B. Eckstein. Educational Services for Pupils in Child-Caring Institutions for the Neglected and Delinquent, 1967-68. CUE, December 1968.

Cohen, Rosalyn S. and Paul Waters. Summer 1967 Program for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Pupils. CUE, November 1967.

Lolis, Kathleen. The Purposes, Goals, and Plans of the "Teacher-Moms" Program, 1965-66. BER, Undated, (mimeo.)

MacVicar, Joan A. Summer 1967 Programs in 16 Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children. CUE, November 1967, (Subcontracted to the Behavioral Sciences Center.)

North, Robert D. and David B. Orr. Guidance in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. The Psychological Corporation (with subcontractual support from Software Systems, Inc.), January 1969.

Sebald, Dorothy Davis. Out-of-School Clinical and Guidance Centers for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Sebald, Dorothy Davis. Evening Guidance Centers for Disadvantaged Pupils of Public and Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Sebald, Dorothy Davis. Inschool Guidance for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. CUE, September 1967.

Tannenbaum, Abraham J. Improving Instruction in Schools for Socially Maladjusted Children and Educational Services for Socially Maladjusted Pupils in Selected Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August, 1966.

Tieman, Norman. Survey of Effects on Pupils in Schools for Socially and Emotionally Maladjusted Children, 1967-68. BER, No. 22-621, September 1968.

Williams, Thelma M. Educational Services for Socially Maladjusted Pupils in Selected Institutional Schools, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

Williams, Thelma M. Improving Instruction for Children in Schools for the Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

Williams, Thelma, M. Supportive Services for the Socially Maladjusted Children in Regular Schools, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

TITLE I PROGRAM REPORTS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Duker, Sam. Programs for Handicapped Children in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. CUE, December 1968.

Fox, David J. and Nick Gavales. Day and Evening Guidance Centers for Mentally Retarded Children and Youth, Summer 1967. CUE, November 1967.

Fox, David J. and Nick Gavales. Summer 1967 School Program for Mentally Retarded Pupils with Teacher Training Component. CUE, November 1967.

Fox, David J., Fred Wright, and Leo Goldstein. Summer 1967 Program for the Educational Support of Hearing-Impaired and Language-Impaired Children. CUE, November 1967.

TITLE I TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM REPORTS

Chapline, Elaine and Thomas Capone. SUTEC, 1966-67: A Project to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of a School-University Teacher Education Center in Preparing Teachers of Disadvantaged Children. BER and Queens College. Undated

Chapline, Elaine and Thomas Capone. School-University Teacher Education Center: (SUTEC), 1967-68. BER and Queens College, No. 22-586, March 1968. (Interim Report.)

Cohen, Rosalyn S. Redevelopment of a Curriculum for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children with a Corollary of Teacher Training, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Gewirtz, Marvin H., Elmer L. Struening, and Evelyn A. Farrar. Teaching the Disadvantaged: Summer 1966 Institutes for Professional Training of Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. CUE, September 1966.

Gewirtz, Marvin H. Teacher Training and Reading Institutes, 1967-68. CUE, October 1968.

Gewirtz, Max and George Weinberg. SUTEC: A Project to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of a School-University Teacher Education Center in Preparing Teachers of Disadvantaged Children, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Harris, Albert J., and others. An Evaluation of the Intensive Teacher training Program, 1965-66. CUNY, June 1967.

Hartley, Ruth E. Demonstration and Teacher Training Program for Teachers of Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

King, M. Sylvester. Local Decentralized Summer Teacher Training Institutes in School Districts with Large Numbers of Disadvantaged Children, Summer 1967. CUE, (Subcontracted to Bank Street College of Education, Educational Resource Center), May 1968.

Long, Charles M. A Project to Develop a Curriculum for Disadvantaged Students in the Intermediate (Middle) Schools, 1965-66. CUE, November 1966.

Lorber, Neil M. Evaluating Operation Leadership: The Principal Internship Program, 1966-67. BER, December 1967.

Lorber, Neil M. and George Forlano. Assessing the After School Workshops Program: Orientation and Inservice Training Program, 1966-67. BER, No. 22-585-32, November 1967.

Morrison, James. Educational TV and Audiovisual Teacher Training Program for Title I Board of Education Teachers of Disadvantaged Pupils in the Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

Senf, Rita. Followup Study of 1966 Summer Institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children. CUE, October 1967.

Tannenbaum, Abraham J. Curriculum Development and Teacher Training for Disadvantaged Pupils in Special Classes (Career Guidance) in Regular Junior High Schools, 1965-66. CUE, September 1966.

Tyree, Marshall. A Project to Provide Teacher-Supervisor Training Needed to Implement, in 12 Schools Servicing Disadvantaged Pupils, the Philosophy, Objectives, and Curriculum Being Developed for Disadvantaged Pupils in the New Type of Intermediate (Middle) School, 1965-66. CUE, August 1966.

Williams, Thelma M. Implementation of the Career Guidance Curriculum and Teacher Training, 1966-67. CUE, October 1967.

TITLE I PARENT, PARAPROFESSIONAL, AND DECENTRALIZED PROGRAM REPORTS

Brown, Roscoe C., Jr. District Decentralized Programs, 1967-68. CUE, December 1968.

Brown, Roscoe C., Jr. Summer 1968 District Decentralized Programs. CUE, December 1968.

Brown, Roscoe C., Jr. District Decentralized Projects, 1968-69. CUE, October 1969.

Castiglione, Lawrence V. Parent Participation Followup Program in 13 Selected Public Schools, 1966-67. CUE, July 1967. (Summary Report.)

Educational Records Bureau. Aides for Title I Teachers in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. ERB, Undated.

Gewirtz, Marvin H. A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools: Parental Involvement in a Reading Improvement Program, 1967-68. CUE, November 1968.

Kravetz, Nathan and Gladys Rothbell. Summer 1969 District Decentralized Programs. CUE, November 1969.

Smith, Inez L., Gilbert M. Trachtman, and Lawrence Walter. An Evaluation of a Program for the Recruitment, Training and Employment of Auxiliary Non-Professional Neighborhood Personnel for Careers in the New York City Schools, 1967-68. NYU, December 1968.

Turner, Richard T. Decentralized District Summer 1967 Programs. BER September 1967.

Turner, Richard T. School Aides for Libraries in Disadvantaged Areas, 1966-67. BER, No. 22-606, September 1967.

MISCELLANEOUS TITLE I REPORTS

Educational Records Bureau. Achievement Tests in Reading and Mathematics for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1967-68. ERB. Undated.

Heller, Barbara R. A History and Description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-1968. CUE, June 1968.

Murray, Kay C. Achievement Tests in Reading and Mathematics for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, 1966-67. BER, No. 22-58333, March 1968.